

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

January 13, 2003

running into situations where majority will is not allowed to function, then we're going to have to reexamine and perhaps change the way we do business. I've been a defender of the status quo. I've been a defender of it in private conversation, in writings in the newspaper and in a book. What has flipped me to the other side is the special session we had in November on the death penalty. I have constituents asking me a question for which I don't have a good answer. Their question is, we had a \$100,000 special session, that we can't afford and that we didn't need, to pass a bill that had overwhelming majority support. Why? Why did you do that? And, well, I think the answer...the Governor said on the radio, in Omaha, in the run-up to that special session, that there's one senator that will paralyze, was his word, paralyze the regular session if we don't pluck this issue out and give it its own special session. And apparently, enough senators agree, that we were not able to shut down the special session. We went ahead with it. I think that's proof, the most compelling proof possible, that we've reached the point described by Senator Brashear two years ago. We've reached a point in which we're no longer functioning healthy as a majority-rule body. A quick history of the cloture rule. For a long time, for most of the existence of the Unicameral, there was no cloture rule. The way debate was ceased was a motion to suspend the rules and cease debate would be filed, and that required 30 votes. Now, I'm not going to hold myself out as an expert, but just in the last few days or so, in doing some research and, more importantly, visiting with people in this body and no longer in this body who were there, who helped create the cloture rule, this is what I've been able to glean. And anyone who's here and can correct me, I welcome you doing that. I don't recall the exact year. It was in the late 1980s or early 1990s that the cloture rule was created. It's been with us about a dozen years. And the concern about the old system was, number one, the motion to suspend the rules was not a priority motion. So if you had 20 amendments stacked up waiting their turn and you filed a motion to cease debate, you still had to wait until running through all those amendments. There was a philosophical concern as well, that there was something unseemly about always jumping out and suspending the rules in order to cease debate. Now, a motion to suspend is, of course, part of the scheme of rules. But still,