

January 15, 1981

rules, to say well, let's forget all that debate. Let's forget all those motions and let's go back to where we were in the beginning, is not really the best solution. We made a decision as far as the seven day and five day recess and there was compromises. Schedules have been set. We really can't go back to the seven day system without causing a great deal of inconvenience for everybody. We resolved within this body at least, the question of a chaplain coordinator. I don't think we need to redebate that issue. So I would suggest that, although on the surface it seems like an easy and quick solution just to go back to where we were the first day, we will be unravelling a good deal of work that has been done and I think it will further confuse the session and will make it look like we spent twelve to fourteen hours debating rules and then decided that all that debate was worthless, we throw out all our decisions, we start all over. That seems to me a major waste of our time.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Vard Johnson.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. President, members of the body, I think Senator Fowler made probably the best speech at this time on Senator Stoney's motion because Senator Fowler points out very simply that what Senator Stoney by his motion would have us do 's to start with the blue book of rules which is where we began this process several days ago and to repudiate all the work that we have done and all the arguments have been made and all the debate that has taken place in the meantime. Now there are some times when you can't go back again. There is no thing as retroactive birth control. You can't go back again on this issue without our having to redo the calendar, without our having to redo the chaplain issue, without our having to redo a number of the other issues that we have very painstakingly, tediously worked out over the last few days. What has happened simply is that a group of senators have held hostage our permanent rules to reargue and relitigate a point. Now our Constitution requires us to have three readings of bills and the function of three bill readings is to make certain that we move with some degree of care in adopting legislation. That is why you have got three cracks at a bill. Three times it has got to get twenty-five votes to advance and to carry. So the concept of rearguing or relitigating a question is not a unique concept but that is done for the purpose of legislation. That is not done for the purpose of rules. Rules don't have near the effect on the people of the State of Nebraska as the substantive legislation does. Rules will govern our operation for three years or for two years and rules can be changed through a process during the