

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

April 10, 2000 LB 1213

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Raikes, why is it necessary for you to suspend the rules?

SENATOR RAIKES: Good question, Senator. I'm not sure that it is absolutely necessary. I'm doing it as a, again, a precautionary move. I want everybody to understand what it is we're doing here, and if there are any questions of germaneness, why I think we should face them outright.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Oh, thank you. Members of the Legislature, if nobody raises the germaneness issue, then it's not necessary to try to suspend the rule, but if a proposition is not germane in the constitutional sense, it means that it's adding a second subject to a bill, and no matter what we do by suspending our rules, it will be an unconstitutional bill. I haven't looked at the bill. I haven't looked at the amendment but it seems like there are a lot of motions made to suspend the germaneness rule and maybe that's because the introducer of the amendment thinks that somebody will challenge it on that basis. I've always been in favor of a very liberal construction of that rule, and I wanted it to correspond to what the Supreme Court has said. Anything that does not constitute a second subject to me is germane to the bill, but naturally our rule is narrower. But it's interesting again to me that I, who abide by the rules, have not had to make a motion to suspend the rules. That's not to say I never will, and I do support motions to suspend, as I shall do in this instance. But sometimes I like to just do a little instructing or reminding people of various things. I voted against the rules which are about to be suspended. Everybody else, save one other individual, voted for these rules. So my colleagues have things that they want to do during the legislative process which they cannot do within the rules. They cannot follow the rules and do what they want to do, so they have to say, rules, get out of my way so that I can function. Then here is old Ernie, always called the obstructionist and the troublemaker, who has never, never kicked the rules aside, who always and ever stays within the rules. But I realize that in the same way that not everybody in an athlete contest is as agile, as swift, as strong or whatever, when it comes to operating within the legislative context, it sometimes becomes necessary for people to say the rules are too binding and restricting; this is something that I really want to