

January 8, 1990

to adopt something like this that I am not going to offer at this point. But there are a couple of observations I would like to make, and this is for the record. I hope the lack of attentiveness is indicative of the lack of support that this proposition that Senator Moore is offering will garner. The very last statement in his proposal says, "A motion to suspend the rules for the purpose of cloture shall not be in order." Well, you just suspend that rule. So really that is a pointless statement designed to make this unpalatable proposition palatable. The one above it, the next to the last sentence says, "A motion for cloture following an unsuccessful motion for cloture shall not be in order until one additional hour of debate has passed." When it comes, Senator Moore, to a motion to kill a bill or to bracket to a time certain, that motion is allowed only one time on a given day at a particular stage of a bill's consideration. So you are departing even from that procedure by this proposition. The third from the bottom sentence says, "A motion for cloture shall have precedence over other motions except a motion to adjourn." That should be stricken and I have an amendment, which among others, would seek to do that, but before I go any further, I am going to see which way the debate goes after this final statement. Senator Moore, if there is a bill that I feel needs some discussion, I can spot it way down the line as any of us can, and I am sure being a scholar of the Bible, as you are, you are aware of this person who was in a cave and saw a cloud that looked like a man...about the size of a man's hand and saw a great way off, and as it came closer, it got larger. Well, if I wanted to have the opportunity to discuss a bill, then I would just start offering my amendments, Senator Moore, before the thing even gets out of committee. The only way that can be countered is for somebody to offer a motion to suspend the rules and allow no debate and no amendment because they cannot move for cloture until at least eight hours of debate on a given day have expired. And I think you have seen in the past that if I really feel that principle is involved, I can carry on a discussion for eight hours, and hold the interest during that time from time to time of even my staunchest opponents. So if the rule is designed to stop certain people or a certain person from discussing an issue at length, it won't achieve that. It is not going to be necessary when you have a proposition that a substantial percentage of the body is interested in because you could not get enough votes for cloture to be successful. So the only purpose is to have a situation where if an individual or a few individuals from a position of principle feel that they have got to use every