

January 6, 1982

conjunction with the following rule that you will consider, the rule that makes it more difficult to suspend our rules which would change it from 30 to 33 votes. The main reason why we have always clung to a 30 vote rule on suspending the rules has been because we have needed a manner to end filibusters and to end the tyranny of the minority. But now with this cloture rule we would have a legitimate means of ending filibusters, a reasonable means and, therefore, I would argue with you that we should make it more difficult to suspend the rules to prevent some of the abusive processes that have come about from time to time. So I hope you will consider not only the cloture rule but I hope you will consider it as considering it as operating in conjunction with the suspension of the rules and the proposed change there and I hope for one year, this year, we could try out a combination of changes in those two rules and see how they work because I am convinced that in the long run it will work much better for the Legislature than what we have been doing. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, at this point in time I would have to rise in opposition to the proposed rule change by Senator Beutler relative to cloture. I want to point out to the members of the body and especially some of the newer members of the body that in the length of time I have been here I have been on the prevailing side a number of times where the filibuster has been used against bills which I was either the principal sponsor or else very vitally interested in and I just want to suggest that at no time, at no time during all those years has it ever been impossible for the introducer of a bill to move that bill within a reasonable time and perhaps in less amount of time that we are talking about here. I want to suggest also that upon those occasions when those bills were being debated and, in fact, from my point of view I might have thought they were being filibustered, that some very worthwhile debate did occur and that some issues were raised and that individuals became more knowledgeable as a result of that discussion. I want to refer back to what Senator Wesely referred to just a little bit ago on the previous motion which he suggested perhaps that if a committee chairman didn't want to take the trouble or the time or wasn't knowledgeable enough to write an explanation of an amendment to a bill that it would be handed to a member of the staff and that the staff do that. Oh, I can remember back in the days, 1970 and so forth, before Senator Wesely, when we had to do most of those things ourselves and we did not rely upon the staff and if there is a weakness in this system that I see, Senator Wesely, it is too