

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

[LB59 LB89 LB97 LB107 LB146 LB202 LB226 LB255 LB281 LB282 LB283 LB284
LB285 LB286 LB287 LB288 LB289 LB290 LB291 LB292 LB293 LB294 LB295 LB296
LB297 LB298 LB299 LB300 LB301 LB302 LB303 LB304 LB305 LB306 LB307 LB308
LB309 LB310 LB311 LB312 LB313 LB314 LB315 LB316 LB317 LB318 LB319 LB320
LB321 LB322 LB323 LB324 LB325 LB326 LB327 LB328 LB329 LB330 LB331 LB332
LB333 LB334 LB335 LB336 LB337 LB338 LB339 LB340 LB341 LB342 LB343 LB344
LB345 LB346 LB347 LB348 LB349 LB350 LB351 LB352 LB353 LB354 LB355 LB356
LB357 LB358 LB359 LB360 LB361 LB362 LB363 LB364 LB365 LB366 LB367 LB368
LB369 LB370 LB371 LB372 LB373 LB374 LB375 LR26CA LR27]

SENATOR GLOOR PRESIDING

SENATOR GLOOR: GOOD MORNING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, AND WELCOME TO THE GEORGE W. NORRIS LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER FOR THE SEVENTH DAY OF THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTH LEGISLATURE, FIRST SESSION. OUR CHAPLAIN FOR TODAY IS PASTOR JOHN HOGUE OF THE FALLS CITY METHODIST CHURCH, FALLS CITY, NEBRASKA, SENATOR WATERMEIER'S DISTRICT. PLEASE RISE.

PASTOR HOGUE: (PRAYER OFFERED.)

SENATOR GLOOR: THANK YOU, PASTOR HOGUE. I CALL TO ORDER THE SEVENTH DAY OF THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTH LEGISLATURE, FIRST SESSION. SENATORS, PLEASE RECORD YOUR PRESENCE. ROLL CALL. MR. CLERK, PLEASE RECORD.

CLERK: I HAVE A QUORUM PRESENT, MR. PRESIDENT.

SENATOR GLOOR: THANK YOU, MR. CLERK. ARE THERE ANY CORRECTIONS FOR THE JOURNAL?

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT. (READ CORRECTIONS, LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGE 165.) THAT'S ALL THAT I HAVE.

SENATOR GLOOR: THANK YOU, MR. CLERK. ARE THERE ANY MESSAGES, REPORTS, OR ANNOUNCEMENTS?

CLERK: THERE ARE, MR. PRESIDENT. I MIGHT ANNOUNCE, REFERENCE COMMITTEE WILL MEET IMMEDIATELY, REFERENCE COMMITTEE IMMEDIATELY IN ROOM 2102. MR. PRESIDENT, HEARING NOTICES FROM THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, FROM THE REVENUE COMMITTEE, AND FROM THE GOVERNMENT, MILITARY AND VETERANS AFFAIRS COMMITTEE. I HAVE A CORRECTED COMMUNICATION FROM THE GOVERNOR WITH RESPECT TO A

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

GUBERNATORIAL APPOINTEE; THAT WILL BE REFERRED TO REFERENCE. AN ANNOUNCEMENT: SENATOR HILKEMANN HAS BEEN SELECTED AS VICE CHAIR OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGES 165-167.)

SENATOR GLOOR: MR. CLERK.

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, I HAVE NEW BILLS. (READ LB281-299 BY TITLE FOR THE FIRST TIME.) AND THAT'S ALL THAT I HAVE AT THIS TIME, MR. PRESIDENT. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGES 167-170.) [LB281 LB282 LB283 LB284 LB285 LB286 LB287 LB288 LB289 LB290 LB291 LB292 LB293 LB294 LB295 LB296 LB297 LB298 LB299]

SENATOR GLOOR: THANK YOU, MR. CLERK. MEMBERS, YOU WILL NOTE ON OUR AGENDA WE HAVE TWO MOTIONS THAT WILL REQUIRE ACTION, WILL REQUIRE A VOTE. WE WILL CONTINUE WITH BILL INTRODUCTION, BUT AS SOON AS THE REFERENCE COMMITTEE COMPLETES THEIR MEETING WE WILL MOVE FORWARD WITH THE AGENDA. I WOULD ASK THAT YOU NOT STRAY TOO FAR FROM THE CHAMBER. THANK YOU. MR. CLERK.

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, NEW BILLS. (READ LB300-318 BY TITLE FOR THE FIRST TIME.) IN ADDITION, MR. PRESIDENT, I HAVE HEARING NOTICES FROM THE NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE, THOSE SIGNED BY SENATOR SCHILZ, AS CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGES 170-173.) [LB300 LB301 LB302 LB303 LB304 LB305 LB306 LB307 LB308 LB309 LB310 LB311 LB312 LB313 LB314 LB315 LB316 LB317 LB318]

SENATOR GLOOR: RETURNING TO THE AGENDA. MR. CLERK.

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, THE FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS, SENATOR SCHEER WOULD MOVE TO WITHDRAW LB59. [LB59]

SENATOR GLOOR: SENATOR SCHEER, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON YOUR MOTION TO WITHDRAW. [LB59]

SENATOR SCHEER: YES, MR. PRESIDENT, I RISE TO REQUEST LB59 TO BE WITHDRAWN. IT WAS BROUGHT TO ME BY A GROUP OF CONSTITUENTS AND, UNFORTUNATELY, WHAT THEY SUGGESTED IN A VERBAL COMMUNICATION, WHEN WE PUT IN IT WRITING AND I GOT IT FROM BILL WRITING AND INTRODUCED, AS THEY LOOKED ON-LINE, FOUND OUT THAT IS NOT EXACTLY WHAT THEY HAD IN MIND. AND RATHER THAN TRY TO MASSAGE IT AND MAKE IT SOMETHING IT'S NOT, I WOULD PREFER JUST TO SIMPLY REMOVE IT FROM THE AGENDA AND TAKE IT OFF THE PLATE OF THE EDUCATION COMMITTEE.

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LB59]

SENATOR GLOOR: THANK YOU, SENATOR SCHEER. MEMBERS, YOU'VE HEARD THE OPENING ON THE MOTION TO WITHDRAW. WE NOW MOVE TO DEBATE. SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LB59]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, WHENEVER A MEMBER WANTS TO WITHDRAW A BILL, I WILL NOT OPPOSE THAT. BUT I'M GOING TO USE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO SAY SOMETHING, AS I'M GOING TO DO EARLY IN THIS SESSION ON ANY NUMBER OF OCCASIONS. OFTEN BILLS ARE BROUGHT TO THIS BODY BY A SENATOR BECAUSE SOMEBODY OR SOME GROUP ASKS THAT IT BE DONE. I THINK...AND IT'S NOT WITH REFERENCE TO WHAT SENATOR SCHEER IS TALKING ABOUT, BECAUSE THAT MIGHT BE AN ENTIRELY DIFFERENT SET OF CIRCUMSTANCES. BUT I HEAR A NUMBER OF SENATORS WHO WILL GET UP AND SAY, SO-AND-SO ASKED ME TO DO THIS, AND IT WOULD BE ONE OF THE MOST BONE-HEADED THINGS I HAVE SEEN IN A LONG TIME. AND COMMITTEES WILL GO ALONG TO ACCOMMODATE THE SENATOR, WHO IS ACCOMMODATING PEOPLE, AND THE LEGISLATURE, AS A RESULT, IS PUT IN A POSITION WHICH I, AS A MEMBER, FEEL OUGHT NOT TO BE THE CASE. SO EVERY SENATOR IS FREE TO CONDUCT HIS OR HER BUSINESS IN ANY WAY HE OR SHE SEES FIT. IF A DRUNK ON THE STREET GIVES AN IDEA TO A SENATOR, THE SENATOR CAN BRING IT, GIVE IT TO A COMMITTEE, AND THE COMMITTEE CAN SEND IT OUT HERE, BUT IT DOESN'T HAVE TO BE DEALT WITH AS THOUGH IT'S SERIOUS OR HAS MERIT. BUT MANY PEOPLE ARE UNWILLING TO DO THE HARD WORK OF WINNOWING OUT TRASH LEGISLATION. AND THIS GIVES ME AN OPPORTUNITY TO TELL SOME OF THESE NEW PEOPLE, ESPECIALLY THE ONES WHO ARE GOING TO BE IN THE GOVERNOR'S COALITION, OR WHATEVER HE CALLED IT, TO STOP ME AND PUT ME IN MY PLACE, TO MAKE ME BEHAVE, NOT DO WHAT THE GOVERNOR DOES NOT LIKE. WELL, THE GOVERNOR IS NOTHING BUT A RICH MAN WHO WAS BORN INTO A RICH FAMILY WHO WAS CODDLED ALL OF HIS LIFE. AND EVEN IF HE HAD TO DO SOMETHING LIKE CHOP KINDLING AND WRAP IT UP WITH A WIRE AND SELL IT IN THE COMMUNITY, HE NEVER HAD TO WORRY ABOUT MEDICAL COVERAGE, CLOTHING, A PLACE TO STAY. SO MAYBE THAT WAS A PART OF HIS UPBRINGING. BUT I'M NOT ONE OF HIS SERVANTS. I DON'T WORK FOR HIM. AND I WAS EMPLOYED, IF AT ALL, BY THE PEOPLE OF MY DISTRICT. AND THEY SENT A MAN, A GROWN MAN, DOWN HERE TO REPRESENT THEIR INTERESTS. AND THE GOVERNOR MAY CRACK A WHIP OVER THE REST OF YOU. HE MAY HERD YOU LIKE A SPANSEL OF MULES, AND IF YOU CHOOSE TO ACCEPT THAT IT'S UP TO YOU. BUT IT'S NOT GOING TO WORK ON ME. NOBODY CAN TREAT ME BETTER THAN I WILL TREAT THEM. BUT THOSE WHO WANT A BATTLE WITH ME, YOU'VE GOT IT. I WILL NOT BLINK. I WILL BE THE LAST MAN STANDING. AND I WANT TO MAKE THIS POINT

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

TOO. I'M GOING TO PUT ON MY LIGHT AGAIN. SOME PEOPLE WHO ARE NOT KNOWLEDGEABLE, WHO ARE NOT OBSERVANT, OR WHO LIVE IN A MAKE-BELIEVE WORLD WHERE THEY HAVE THE NOTION THAT IF THEY WISH FOR SOMETHING, IT WILL BECOME REALITY, AS A BLACK MAN WHO HAS BEEN IN THIS WORLD LONGER THAN ANYBODY ON THIS FLOOR WHO HAS BEEN ELECTED, LET ME TELL YOU ONE THING. THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS A "POSTRACIAL" OR "POSTRACIST" SOCIETY IN AMERICA. JUST BECAUSE A BLACK MAN WAS ELECTED PRESIDENT DOES NOT MEAN THAT RACISM HAS IN ANY WAY DIMINISHED. IN FACT, IT HAS BEEN EXACERBATED. THERE'S NO WAY, WHEN IF THAT WHITE GOVERNOR WERE SPEAKING TO YOU ALL ABOUT THE STATE OF NEBRASKA, I JUMPED UP AND SAID, YOU LIE, AS SOME RACIST DID WHEN THE PRESIDENT WAS SPEAKING BEFORE A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS GIVING THE STATE OF THE UNION, THAT WAS HO-HUM. AND A LOT OF WHITE PEOPLE WENT ALONG WITH IT, BECAUSE A BLACK MAN HAD NO BUSINESS BEING PRESIDENT ANYWAY. I SAW WHERE SOME OLD-TIME CONSERVATIVE HAD A BLOG WHERE HE REFERRED TO THE PRESIDENT AS A HALF-BREED. AND HE SAYS HE DIDN'T DO IT, BUT HE WON'T TELL WHO DID. HE'S RESPONSIBLE. AND THE REASON HE DOESN'T WANT TO TELL WHO DID IT, BECAUSE HE DID IT. AND HE CAN LEAVE IT OUT THERE SO THAT IT WILL BE BLAMED ON THIS AMORPHOUS "SOMEBODY ELSE." HE DID IT. [LB59]

SENATOR GLOOR: TIME, SENATOR. BUT YOU ARE NEXT IN THE QUEUE. PLEASE CONTINUE. [LB59]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. AND THIS WILL DEMONSTRATE THAT I WILL TAKE THE TIME THAT I NEED UNDER THE RULES TO SAY WHAT I'VE GOT TO SAY. I LOOK AT ALL THIS HUBBUB ABOUT WHAT'S HAPPENING IN PARIS. THAT'S BAD, INEXCUSABLE. BUT IN NIGERIA, HUNDREDS OF BLACK MEN, WOMEN, AND CHILDREN ARE BEING KILLED, HUNDREDS. BUT THEY'RE THE WRONG COLOR. I THOUGHT THAT WHEN THAT GUY NAMED DONNE WROTE NO MAN IS AN ISLAND ENTIRE UNTO ITSELF, EACH IS A PART OF THE MAIN, EVERY MAN'S DEATH DIMINISHES ME, THEN BLACK PEOPLE MUST NOT BE A PART OF THAT MAIN. A BLACK MALE, SUCH AS MYSELF, IS NOT A MAN. ALL I NEED TO KNOW IS WHAT THE RULES OF THE GAME ARE OR, AS WHITE PEOPLE SAY, THE RULES OF ENGAGEMENT. AND I KNOW WHAT THEY ARE. AND BACK TO A BLACK PRESIDENT BEING ELECTED, EVERY PRESIDENT BEFORE HIM WAS WHITE. SO WHY DO WHITE PEOPLE HAVE ANY COMPLAINTS? WHY DO YOU HAVE POOR WHITE PEOPLE IN APPALACHIA? WHY DO YOU HAVE IGNORANT WHITE PEOPLE IN LOUISIANA? IN MISSISSIPPI? IN ARKANSAS? IN GEORGIA? WHY IS THAT? WHY ARE THERE ANY WHITE MEN WITH COMPLAINTS AND GRIPES? NO WHITE PERSON SHOULD COMPLAIN ABOUT ANYTHING BECAUSE YOU'VE HAD EVERYTHING YOUR WAY. YOU'VE HAD NOTHING BUT WHITE PRESIDENTS. YOU'VE BEEN IN CONTROL OF EVERYTHING, AND LOOK AT THE

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

MESS. BUT I WAGER THAT IF A BLACK MAN HAD BEEN RESPONSIBLE, THEY'D BE SAYING, SEE THERE, SEE THERE? UNEMPLOYMENT IS DOWN. STOCK MARKET IS UP. BUT PRESIDENT OBAMA HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH THAT. BACK TO THE POINT AT HAND, WHICH IS THIS LEGISLATURE, I HAVE IN THE PAST BEEN VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE LEGISLATURE AS AN INSTITUTION. THOSE WHO PAY ATTENTION WILL NOT HAVE PAID CLOSE-ENOUGH ATTENTION TO REALIZE THAT I NEVER REFER TO THIS PLACE AS MY LEGISLATURE. I REFER TO IT AS THE LEGISLATURE OR YOUR LEGISLATURE. I NEVER REFER TO AMERICA AS MY COUNTRY BUT AS THIS COUNTRY OR YOUR COUNTRY. I BELIEVE IN DEALING WITH THE REALITY THAT I CONFRONT. AND IF I, WHO AM AWARE OF IT, AM TOO CHICKEN-HEARTED, TOO LILY-LIVERED, TOO SPINELESS TO CALL IT LIKE IT IS, I SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN ELECTED BY THE PEOPLE WHO SENT ME DOWN HERE. BUT THE PEOPLE SENT ME DOWN HERE BECAUSE THEY KNOW THE MANNER OF MAN THAT I AM, AND I AM NOT THE MANNER OF MAN I AM BECAUSE PEOPLE VOTED FOR ME AND SENT ME HERE. AND I WILL EXPRESS MY VIEWS. BUT YOU KNOW WHAT? TALKING ABOUT RACISM, THIS HAPPENS TO BE THE FIRST TIME IN THE HISTORY OF FRANCE THAT THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE IS A BLACK WOMAN. AND I'M SURE HE WAS WHITE, SOME CONSERVATIVE REFERRED TO HER AS A MONKEY. AND THAT MAGAZINE, WHICH ALL THESE WHITE PEOPLE ARE SAYING THEY'RE CHARLIE, WELL, THAT'S KIND OF IRONIC BECAUSE BLACK PEOPLE HAVE ALWAYS REFERRED TO WHITE PEOPLE AS MR. CHARLIE AND THAT WAS NOT A TERM... [LB59]

SENATOR GLOOR: ONE MINUTE. [LB59]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...OF RESPECT. SO AS ONE BLACK COLUMNIST WROTE, I'M NOT CHARLIE. THAT MAGAZINE IS RACIST. IT'S PROVOCATIVE. AND THE ONES WHO PUT IT OUT ASSUME THE RISK OF DOING SO. DO I APPROVE OF WHAT HAPPENED IN PARIS? WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES IT MAKE WHETHER I APPROVE OR DISAPPROVE? DO I APPROVE OF WHAT THE ISRAELIS ARE DOING TO THE PALESTINIANS? WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES IT MAKE IF I APPROVE OR DISAPPROVE? THINGS ARE GOING TO HAPPEN OVER WHICH I HAVE NO CONTROL. BUT I WILL SPEAK ABOUT THEM. AND WHEN WE GET INTO THIS DISCUSSION OF THE RULES, I WANT TO LET YOU ALL KNOW THAT IF YOU WATCH THIS MOVIE WHERE JOAN CRAWFORD, I THINKS IT WAS, OR SOMEBODY PORTRAYED JOAN CRAWFORD, BUT ANYWAY, THIS WOMAN WAS ON THE BOARD OF COCA-COLA. [LB59]

SENATOR GLOOR: TIME, SENATOR. BUT YOU'RE ON YOUR THIRD TIME, NEXT IN THE QUEUE. [LB59]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. [LB59]

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

SENATOR GLOOR: THANK YOU. [LB59]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ON THE BOARD OF COCA-COLA, AND SHE USED THE F-WORD TO THESE MEN AND SAID, FELLOWS, I'VE BEEN ON THIS MERRY-GO-ROUND BEFORE. AND I HAVE BEEN ON THIS MERRY-GO-ROUND MANY TIMES. AND THERE HAVE BEEN EFFORTS BY THE LEGISLATURE TO CRAFT RULES--AND SOME OF YOUR WORST RULES ARE IN THAT BOOK--TO TRY TO PUT ME IN A BOX, AND THEY COULDN'T DO IT. AND YOU CAN'T DO IT EITHER. BUT I WELCOME YOU TO TRY. AND I JUST DON'T WANT THERE TO BE ANY MISAPPREHENSIONS ON THE PART OF ANYBODY. AND FOR THE NEW PEOPLE, WE DIDN'T HIRE YOU. YOU WERE ELECTED. EVERY RIGHT, PRIVILEGE, RESPONSIBILITY, DUTY THAT FALLS UPON ANYBODY WHO'S A MEMBER OF THE LEGISLATURE IS UPON YOU. YOU DON'T HAVE TO GET ANYBODY'S PERMISSION TO DO ANYTHING. BUT IF YOU BRING SOME TRASH IN HERE, BECAUSE SOMEBODY MADE A FOOL OUT OF YOU, THEN EXPECT TO BE TREATED ACCORDINGLY. AND YOU KNOW WHY I TRY TO KILL SO MUCH TRASH LEGISLATION? BECAUSE PREVENTION IS BETTER THAN CURE. SOMEBODY USED A SHOPWORN CLICHE TO DESCRIBE SOMETHING THAT HAPPENED THE OTHER DAY, AND FOR SOME PEOPLE, THEY FEEL IT'S EASIER TO BEG FORGIVENESS THAN TO GET PERMISSION. IN OTHER WORDS, JUST DO WHATEVER YOU WANT TO DO AND THEN JUST SAY, WELL, I'M SORRY. BUT THAT DOESN'T CUT ICE WITH EVERYBODY. SO IMAGINE A PRECIPICE 500 FEET FROM THE BOTTOM TO THE TOP, AND IT'S A PLACE WHERE TOURISTS GO. THEY TAKE THEIR LITTLE CHILDREN BECAUSE OF THE WONDERFUL PANORAMIC VIEW. AND LITTLE CHILDREN HAVE FALLEN OFF. THEIR PARENTS HAVE FALLEN. SO I COME ALONG AND I SAY, WHY DON'T YOU DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT? THEY SAY, WELL, WE'VE GOT A CEMETERY AT THE BOTTOM FOR THOSE WHO DIE AND A HOSPITAL FOR THOSE WHO SURVIVE. AND I SAY, WELL, LET'S MAKE IT BETTER FOR EVERYBODY AND PUT A PROTECTIVE FENCE AROUND THE RIM SO THAT NOBODY WILL FALL OVER THE EDGE. I TRY TO KILL TRASH LEGISLATION TO KEEP THE LEGISLATURE FROM GOING OVER THE EDGE. I'M THE GARBAGE MAN. I'M THE TRASH COLLECTOR. I'M THE CLEANUP MAN AND THAT IS A ROLE THAT I INTEND TO FULFILL. AND I WILL HAVE MORE TO SAY AS WE DISCUSS THE RULES. BUT ONE THING I WANT TO SAY TO MY COLLEAGUES: IT'S SO GOOD TO BE BACK. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LB59]

SENATOR GLOOR: THANK YOU, SENATOR CHAMBERS. ARE THERE OTHER SENATORS WISHING TO BE RECOGNIZED? SEEING NONE, SENATOR SCHEER, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE ON YOUR MOTION TO WITHDRAW. SENATOR SCHEER WAIVES. MEMBERS, THE QUESTION BEFORE US IS THE WITHDRAWAL OF LB59. THOSE IN FAVOR VOTE AYE; THOSE OPPOSED VOTE NAY. HAVE ALL

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

VOTED WHO CARE TO? RECORD, MR. CLERK. [LB59]

CLERK: 40 AYES, 0 NAYS, MR. PRESIDENT, ON THE ADOPTION OF THE MOTION TO WITHDRAW LB59. [LB59]

SENATOR GLOOR: THE MOTION IS APPROVED. MR. CLERK, ITEMS FOR THE RECORD? [LB59]

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, SOME NEW BILLS. (READ LB319-332 BY TITLE FOR THE FIRST TIME.) MR. PRESIDENT, I ALSO HAVE A REFERENCE REPORT REFERRING LB193 THROUGH LB280. THOSE WILL BE...THAT SIGNED BY SENATOR KRIST, AS CHAIR OF REFERENCE. HEARING NOTICES FROM THE HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE; THOSE SIGNED BY SENATOR CAMPBELL. THAT'S ALL THAT I HAVE, MR. PRESIDENT. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGES 174-179.) [LB319 LB320 LB321 LB322 LB323 LB324 LB325 LB326 LB327 LB328 LB329 LB330 LB331 LB332]

SPEAKER HADLEY PRESIDING

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, MR. CLERK. I WILL RECOGNIZE THE CLERK.

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, THE NEXT ITEM OF BUSINESS, SENATOR GARRETT, AS CHAIR OF THE RULES COMMITTEE, WOULD MOVE FOR THE ADOPTION OF THE PERMANENT RULES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTH LEGISLATURE, FIRST SESSION, AND ANY SPECIAL SESSIONS HELD DURING THE 2015 CALENDAR YEAR. PURSUANT TO THAT MOTION, I HAVE A REPORT FROM THE RULES COMMITTEE, MR. PRESIDENT, WHEREIN THEY HAVE PROPOSED TWO CHANGES. THE FIRST IS A PROPOSAL...AND, BY THE WAY, I MIGHT INDICATE TO THE MEMBERSHIP, COPIES OF THE RULES COMMITTEE REPORT ARE ON YOUR DESK, BOTH THOSE THAT WERE REPORTED TO THE FLOOR AS WELL AS THOSE THAT WEREN'T. THE FIRST TWO ARE THOSE THAT WERE REPORTED TO THE FLOOR FOR CONSIDERATION. SENATOR GARRETT, I HAVE WHAT IS BEFORE ME, AN AMENDMENT TO RULE 5, SECTION 5, SENATOR.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR GARRETT, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON YOUR ADOPTION OF THE PERMANENT RULES.

SENATOR GARRETT: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER. COLLEAGUES, WELCOME TO THE INAUGURAL LEGISLATIVE FIREWORKS EVENT. WE HAD A NUMBER OF RULES. I THINK BEFORE YOU WE PUT THE ONES THAT WE TABLED FOR...THE ONES THAT WE PASSED OUT OF COMMITTEE AS WELL AS THE ONES THAT WE INDEFINITELY POSTPONED FOR YOUR PERUSAL. IT WAS AN INTERESTING RULES COMMITTEE MEETING AND I THINK WE ARE GOING TO SEE SOME

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

FIREWORKS HERE THIS MORNING. BUT THE RULES THAT WE DID END UP AS THE PROPOSED RULES CHANGES, WE DID PASS, FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION ARE BOTH FROM SENATOR COASH AND FROM SENATOR MURANTE. AND I WILL YIELD MY TIME TO SENATOR COASH TO EXPLAIN HIS PROPOSED RULE CHANGE FOR THE RULE 5, SECTION 5.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR COASH, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR COASH: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. GOOD MORNING, COLLEAGUES. AS SENATOR GARRETT INDICATED, ONE OF THE RULE CHANGES THAT WAS ADOPTED WAS PROPOSED BY ME. I WILL COVER THAT BRIEFLY. IT'S PRETTY SELF-EXPLANATORY. IT IS ON THE FIRST PAGE OF THE HANDOUT THAT SENATOR GARRETT GAVE TO US. I HAVE BEEN CHAIR OF THE STATE-TRIBAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE FOR THE PAST TWO YEARS AND SERVED ON THE COMMITTEE IN MY WHOLE TIME OF BEING HERE IN THE PAST SIX YEARS. THE STATE-TRIBAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE IS A SELECT COMMITTEE. IT DOES NOT GET BILLS REFERENCED TO IT, BUT IT DOES MEET AT REQUEST OF THE CHAIR. AND THIS COMMITTEE IS DEFINED IN STATUTE. AND IN A NUTSHELL, WHAT IT'S CHARGED TO DO IS TO BE A LIAISON BETWEEN THIS BODY AND THE SOVEREIGN TRIBES WITHIN OUR BORDERS, TO WORK WITH THE TRIBES THAT ARE RECOGNIZED IN OUR STATE, TO COMMUNICATE WITH THEM, AND TO HELP BE THEIR VOICE IN THIS BODY. I HAVE BROUGHT BILLS THROUGH THE STATE-TRIBAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE. THOSE BILLS DO GET REFERENCED TO THE COMMITTEE OF SUBJECT MATTER, EVEN THOUGH THEY MIGHT BE A STATE-TRIBAL RELATIONS BILL. HOWEVER, I AM...THE CHAIR IS UNABLE TO ASSIGN A COMMITTEE PRIORITY BILL TO THOSE BILLS. THEY HAVE TO BE PRIORITIZED BY AN INDIVIDUAL SENATOR OR THE COMMITTEE THAT HEARD THE BILL OR THE SPEAKER. SO I PROPOSED A RULE CHANGE ALLOWING FOR THE STATE-TRIBAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE TO DESIGNATE ONE BILL AS A COMMITTEE PRIORITY BILL, WITH THE CONSENT OF THE INTRODUCER. IT IS MY HOPE THAT AS THIS BODY MOVES FORWARD AND RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE TRIBES CONTINUE TO...THE TRIBE...AS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TRIBES AND THE LEGISLATURE CONTINUES DOWN THE ROAD, THAT THEY WILL USE THIS PRIORITY BILL AS A WAY TO FURTHER THAT DISCUSSION, MOVE INITIATIVES FORWARD, AND CONTINUE ON THAT ROAD. SO WITH THAT, I WOULD ASK FOR YOUR ADOPTION OF THE RULES AS STATED. AND IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RULE THAT I PROPOSED, I WILL BE GLAD TO ANSWER THEM. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR COASH. SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

LEGISLATURE, I'D LIKE TO ASK SENATOR COASH A QUESTION OR TWO.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR COASH, WILL YOU YIELD TO A QUESTION?

SENATOR COASH: YES, I WILL.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, SENATOR COASH. THIS IS IN THE FORM OF QUESTION AND ANSWER, TO HAVE SOME ITEMS RIGHT TOGETHER AND LOOKED AT SPECIFICALLY. DOES THIS COMMITTEE CONDUCT ANY HEARINGS?

SENATOR COASH: IT CAN CONDUCT HEARINGS. AS CHAIR OF THAT COMMITTEE, I'VE HAD HEARINGS ON ISSUES. BUT IT DOES NOT GET BILLS REFERENCED TO IT FOR THE PURPOSES OF A HEARING IN THAT WAY.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SO IT'S JUST A COMMITTEE, MEANING A GROUP OF SENATORS LABELED A COMMITTEE, BUT IT HAS NONE OF THE PREROGATIVES OF ANY OTHER COMMITTEE. IS THAT TRUE OR FALSE?

SENATOR COASH: THAT'S CORRECT.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: AND YOU THINK THAT THIS "NONCOMMITTEE" COMMITTEE SHOULD HAVE THE POWER TO DESIGNATE ONE BILL AS A PRIORITY BILL. TRUE OR FALSE?

SENATOR COASH: YES, SENATOR.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: DOES THAT BILL HAVE TO PERTAIN SPECIFICALLY AND DIRECTLY TO THE ISSUES COVERED BY THIS COMMITTEE?

SENATOR COASH: YES, IT DOES.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: WHERE IS THAT IN THE...THIS PROPOSAL?

SENATOR COASH: IF YOU SEE ON THE SECOND LINE, IT SAYS THAT THE BILL HAS TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE COMMITTEE'S JURISDICTION.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: AND "CONSISTENT" MEANS WHAT?

SENATOR COASH: "CONSISTENT" MEANS THAT THE JURISDICTION, PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE, REMAINS THE SAME AS HAS BEEN IN THE PAST.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: IF THAT JURISDICTION SHOULD CHANGED, WHAT BECOMES OF THIS? THEN IT CANNOT OFFER A BILL, OR THE TYPE OF BILL IT

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

CAN OFFER WOULD CHANGE AS THE JURISDICTION OF THE COMMITTEE MAY BE CHANGED BY THE LEGISLATURE.

SENATOR COASH: THE JURISDICTION OF THIS COMMITTEE IS OUTLINED IN STATUTE. SO IF THE LEGISLATURE CHANGED THE JURISDICTION, THIS RULE WOULD FOLLOW WITH THAT STATUTE CHANGE.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: WHY DON'T YOU ASK FOR THE CREATION OF ANOTHER COMMITTEE THAT HAS ALL THE DIGNITY AND STATURE OF EVERY OTHER COMMITTEE THAT DEALS WITH THE ISSUES OF WHITE PEOPLE--OH, PARDON ME--WITH BROADER ISSUES?

SENATOR COASH: WELL, SENATOR, I DON'T...I DIDN'T FEEL THAT CREATING A COMMITTEE OF THAT NATURE WAS NECESSARY. THIS COMMITTEE WAS PUT TOGETHER FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. I DON'T...IT'S ISN'T GOING TO GET A LOT OF BILLS. IN FACT, ALTHOUGH THE COMMITTEE HAS BEEN IN PLACE FOR WELL PAST MY TIME, I WAS THE FIRST SENATOR TO BRING A BILL THAT WAS SPONSORED BY THE STATE-TRIBAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SENATOR, AS CHAIRPERSON OF THAT COMMITTEE, YOU WOULD HAVE BROUGHT TO YOUR ATTENTION ISSUES THAT ARE DEEMED VERY IMPORTANT TO THOSE CONSTITUENCIES THAT YOU MENTIONED IN YOUR OPENING. IS THAT TRUE?

SENATOR COASH: YES.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: YOU COULD OFFER SUCH A BILL, COULDN'T YOU?

SENATOR COASH: YES.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: IF I BECOME VERY CONCERNED ABOUT WHAT'S HAPPENING TO POOR PEOPLE...AND THAT EMBRACES WHITE PEOPLE TOO. ALL OF YOU ARE MY BROTHERS AND SISTERS, SOMETIMES HARDHEADED, SOMETIMES RECALCITRANT. BUT BECAUSE THEY DO ALL THIS PRAYING, I'M GOING TO QUOTE FROM SOMETHING: OF ONE BLOOD GOD MADE ALL MANKIND ON EARTH. SO THAT MAKES US ALL BROTHERS AND SISTERS. BUT IT DOESN'T PAN OUT THAT WAY. SENATOR COASH, IF I'M VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE ISSUES OF BLACK PEOPLE, WOULD YOU SUPPORT THE CREATION OF A COMMITTEE THAT WOULD DEAL WITH THE INTERESTS OF BLACK OR AFRICAN-AMERICAN OR PEOPLE OF COLOR WITH THE SAME STATURE AS THIS COMMITTEE AND THAT COMMITTEE BE GIVEN THE POWER TO DESIGNATE A PRIORITY BILL?

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE, SENATOR.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: AND WHEN I SAY CREATE IT, I MEAN IN STATUTE, EXACTLY AS THIS ONE YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT WAS CREATED. WOULD YOU SUPPORT THAT?

SENATOR COASH: YES, I WOULD.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, I'M GOING TO PUT ON MY LIGHT BECAUSE I CAN'T FINISH WHAT I'M SAYING THIS TIME AND I'LL HAVE A FEW MORE COMMENTS. THANK YOU.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED AND THIS IS YOUR SECOND TIME TO SPEAK ON THIS.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, DOWN THROUGH THE YEARS, I HAVE WORKED ASSIDUOUSLY ON ISSUES THAT ADDRESSED THE PROBLEMS OF NATIVE AMERICANS. I GOT RID OF WHAT WAS CALLED A BOUNTY BILL THAT WAS BEING IMPOSED IN ONE OF THOSE BACKWARD, RACIST COUNTIES IN THE STATE OF NEBRASKA. I'VE BEEN INVOLVED IN BOUNDARY ISSUES, LAW ENFORCEMENT ISSUES THAT PERTAIN TO THE RESERVATION. BUT AS A MEMBER OF THE LEGISLATURE, I'M LOOKING AT THE STRUCTURE, I'M LOOKING AT THE PROCESS, AND I'M LOOKING AT THE WAY WE FUNCTION. SINCE THE LEGISLATURE CREATED THIS COMMITTEE, THE LEGISLATURE CAN ENDOW IT WITH ALL OF THE TRAPPINGS AND ACCOUTREMENTS OF EVERY OTHER COMMITTEE THAT EXISTS IN THE LEGISLATURE, AND THEN THERE WILL BE AN AUTOMATIC ATTACHMENT TO THAT COMMITTEE OF EVERYTHING THAT APPLIES TO EVERY OTHER COMMITTEE. THE SETTING ASIDE, THE ISOLATION, THE MARGINALIZING OF GROUPS CAN OCCUR AS EASILY THROUGH THOSE EFFORTS THAT ON THE FACE APPEAR TO BE IN THEIR INTERESTS BUT MANY TIMES ALL THEY DO IS DEEPEN THE DIVIDE, SHARPEN THE LINES THAT SEPARATE THEM FROM EVERYBODY ELSE. I WILL NOT SUPPORT THIS. IF THERE WAS SOMETHING IN OUR PRACTICE OR IN OUR RULES OR IN THE STATUTE WHICH SAID THAT NO BILL CAN BE OFFERED BY ANY SENATOR OR COMMITTEE ADDRESSING THE NEEDS OR INTERESTS OR CONCERNS OF THESE CONSTITUENCIES, I WOULD FIGHT TO GET THAT WHOLE THING STRUCK DOWN. BUT SENATOR COASH WANTED TO BE THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE COMMITTEE AND--I'M GIVING MY OPINION--THAT CARRIES WITH IT A DUTY AND A RESPONSIBILITY. IF THERE IS AN ISSUE THAT IS SERIOUS ENOUGH TO BE REDUCED TO A BILL, IT SHOULD BE SERIOUS ENOUGH FOR THE CHAIRPERSON OF THAT COMMITTEE TO OFFER THAT BILL, TO FIGHT FOR IT, AND TO PRIORITIZE IT. I'M NOT GAY. I'M HAPPY SOME...WELL, HAPPY I'M NOT. I'M CHEERFUL SOMETIMES, BUT I HAVE

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

OFFERED BILLS TO PROHIBIT DISCRIMINATION BASED ON SEXUAL ORIENTATION MORE THAN ANYBODY OR ALL THE OTHER SENATORS PUT TOGETHER. I OFFER IT. I FIGHT IT. I TRY TO AMEND OTHER BILLS WITH THAT PROPOSITION. AND I HAVE NOT ASKED THAT A COMMITTEE BE ESTABLISHED TO LOOK INTO THAT ISSUE BECAUSE THESE ARE PEOPLE. THESE ARE OUR BROTHERS AND SISTERS. IF WE CAN PASS LAWS TO PROTECT EVERYBODY ELSE, WE CAN PASS LAWS, AND SHOULD, TO PROTECT THEM. SO I AM GOING TO MAKE IT CLEAR WITH A CATEGORICAL STATEMENT, IF I HAVEN'T MADE IT THROUGH THIS DISCUSSION, I WILL NOT SUPPORT THIS RULE CHANGE. I WILL NOT SUPPORT IT. AND I THINK THE REASONS YOU MAY BE ABLE TO DERIVE FROM WHAT I'VE SAID, BUT I'LL TRY TO ENCAPSULATE THEM. THE PROCESS THAT WE HAVE IS WHAT IT IS. AND I AM GOING TO DO WHATEVER I CAN TO SEE THAT OUR FUNCTIONING, OUR AFFAIRS ARE KEPT AS REGULAR AS IS POSSIBLE IN A DIVERSE BODY SUCH AS THIS ONE. I DON'T MEAN RACIALLY DIVERSE. I MEAN YOU HAVE SOME PEOPLE RANGING FROM GENIUS TO IDIOT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE, SENATOR CHAMBERS.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: AND I'M FREE TO USE MY TIME IN THE WAY THAT I SEE FIT. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I...(MICROPHONE MALFUNCTION). EXCUSE ME. SOMEBODY ELSE'S IS THE POWER. BUT NEVERTHELESS, MINE REMAINS THE GLORY. AND I'M NOT QUITE READY TO SAY AMEN JUST YET. BUT I'M READY NOW TO TURN ON MY LIGHT AGAIN AND I WILL STOP FOR THIS TIME SPEAKING.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR CHAMBERS. THE CHAIR RECOGNIZES SENATOR CAMPBELL.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. AND GOOD MORNING, COLLEAGUES. I WOULD LIKE TO STAND IN SUPPORT OF THIS RULE CHANGE AND WHAT SENATOR COASH IS TRYING TO ACHIEVE HERE. FROM THE HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES PERSPECTIVE, WE HAVE WORKED WITH SENATOR COASH'S COMMITTEE IN THE LAST COUPLE OF YEARS BECAUSE THERE HAVE BEEN CHANGES THAT HAVE COME ABOUT IN ICWA, WHICH STANDS FOR THE INDIAN CHILD WELFARE ACT. AND ICWA COMES FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. AND IN MANY CASES, HOW WE DEAL WITH FAMILIES AND CHILDREN AND EXTENDED FAMILIES OF OUR TRIBES IN THE STATE IS DIFFERENT THAN HOW WE WILL UTILIZE THE CHILD WELFARE LAWS FOR OTHER CITIZENS. AND I EXPECT THAT THERE WILL BE OTHER CHANGES THAT WILL NEED TO COME TO THE INDIAN CHILD WELFARE ACT, BUT IT IS ONE EXAMPLE, FROM MY PERSPECTIVE, THAT THE KNOWLEDGE THAT IS GAINED BY THE COMMITTEE THAT SENATOR COASH HAS CHAIRED HAS BEEN INSTRUMENTAL IN MAKING CHANGES AND, WHAT SHOULD I SAY, CHANGES

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

NOT ONLY IN THE STATUTES THAT MAY BE NECESSARY BUT AS WE WORK WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. AND AT TIMES, THAT HAS JUST NOT BEEN UNDER THE PURVIEW OF THE HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE AND WE HAVE NEEDED ASSISTANCE FROM THE TRIBAL RELATIONS. AND SO I DO SUPPORT THIS. I KNOW THAT THERE WILL BE INSTANCES IN WHICH HAVING THAT PRIORITY TO PUT FORWARD IN THE INDIAN CHILD WELFARE ACT WOULD HAVE BEEN PARTICULARLY HELPFUL. I UNDERSTAND WHAT SENATOR CHAMBERS IS SAYING. BUT IN THE CASE, IN THIS CASE, THE TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE THAT IS ACHIEVED BY OUR COMMITTEE IN HELPING CHILDREN AND THE FAMILIES OF TRIBES HAS BEEN EXTREMELY HELPFUL. AND THEREFORE, I DO SUPPORT WHAT IS PROPOSED TO YOU TODAY. THANK YOU, COLLEAGUES. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR CAMPBELL. SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED, AND THIS IS YOUR THIRD TIME.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I WOULD LIKE TO ASK SENATOR CAMPBELL A QUESTION OR TWO, IF SHE WILL RESPOND.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR CAMPBELL, WILL YOU YIELD TO A QUESTION?

SENATOR CAMPBELL: CERTAINLY.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SENATOR CAMPBELL, ARE YOU AWARE OF THE FACT THAT A COMMITTEE CAN INTRODUCE ANY KIND OF BILL THAT IT CHOOSES AND THE MEMBERS CAN SIGN IT?

SENATOR CAMPBELL: YES, SENATOR CHAMBERS, I AM AWARE OF THAT. AND WE ALSO HAVE TWO PRIORITIES AS A COMMITTEE IN ADDITION TO THE PRIORITY OF THE MEMBERS.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: AND THIS ONE WOULDN'T BE ONE OF THEM, JUST BEING FRANK. ISN'T THAT TRUE?

SENATOR CAMPBELL: SENATOR CHAMBERS, WHAT WE RAN INTO WHEN WE DEALT WITH A LOT OF...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: BUT I'M GOING TO RUN OUT OF TIME.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: OH.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THIS WOULD NOT BE ONE OF THE TWO PRIORITIES, WOULD IT?

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

SENATOR CAMPBELL: IT MAY OR IT MAY NOT, DEPENDING UPON WHAT OTHER ACTION WE HAD TO TAKE.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, SENATOR COASH CAN OFFER THE BILL. HE JUST HAS TO DETERMINE THAT IT HAS A HIGHER PRIORITY THAN ANYTHING ELSE HE'S CONSIDERING AT THAT TIME, OR SEE IF SOMEBODY ELSE WILL PRIORITIZE THE BILL THAT HE WOULD INTRODUCE. I'D LIKE TO ASK SENATOR COASH ANOTHER QUESTION.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR COASH, WILL YOU YIELD TO A QUESTION?

SENATOR COASH: YES, I WILL.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SENATOR COASH, THAT NATIVE AMERICAN WELFARE ACT THAT SENATOR CAMPBELL MENTIONED MAY BE A FEDERAL ENACTMENT ORIGINALLY, BUT THERE HAD TO BE A STATE VERSION ENACTED. IS THAT CORRECT?

SENATOR COASH: THAT IS CORRECT.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: DO YOU KNOW WHO INTRODUCED SUCH A BILL?

SENATOR COASH: INTRODUCED THE BILL TO HAVE THE STATE...?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: TO CREATE THAT ACT AT THE STATE LEVEL?

SENATOR COASH: I DO NOT.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE NAME OF THE BILL WAS, BUT NATIVE AMERICAN CHILDREN WERE BEING TAKEN FOR ADOPTION BY WHITE PEOPLE AND OTHER THINGS WERE BEING DONE. AND I OFFERED LEGISLATION TO ADDRESS THOSE ISSUES. I OFFERED THE BILL. I DON'T KNOW IF I NEEDED TO PRIORITIZE IT, BUT IF I DID, OBVIOUSLY I DID BECAUSE IT BECAME LAW. AND THERE HAVE BEEN SOME CASES IN NEBRASKA THAT WERE DECIDED BY THE NEBRASKA SUPREME COURT PURSUANT TO THAT LEGISLATION. IF SOMETHING CAN BE DONE ALREADY, WHY TACK AN ADDITIONAL APPENDAGE ONTO OUR RULES AND OUR PROCESS? WE ARE LOOKING AT THE GOVERNING STRUCTURE, AT LEAST ON PAPER, TO TELL US HOW THE LEGISLATURE IS GOING TO FUNCTION. AND IF THIS PORTRAYS ME AS A MEAN PERSON, I DON'T EVEN CARE. I'M DOING WHAT I THINK IS BEST FOR THIS INSTITUTION. DON'T TAKE FROM A SENATOR HIS OR HER RESPONSIBILITY AND SAY GIVE ME

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

SOMETHING THAT NOBODY ELSE HAS. I THINK IT'S A PRIORITY, BUT I DON'T WANT TO HAVE TO GIVE UP ONE OF MY OTHER PRIORITIES. I WANT TO STOP THE STATE FROM KILLING PEOPLE AND I WANT TO STOP THESE BUTCHERS CALLED HUNTERS FROM KILLING MOUNTAIN LIONS. BUT IF I'M GOING TO PRIORITIZE A BILL, I'D HAVE TO PICK ONE OR THE OTHER. THIS COMMITTEE DEALS WITH A SUBJECT THAT WE ALL MAY RELATE TO AND BE SYMPATHETIC TOWARD. WE'RE NOT TALKING ABOUT THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE COMMITTEE NOW. WE'RE TALKING ABOUT HOW IT FUNCTIONS AND WHAT PREROGATIVES IT'S GOING TO HAVE. AND BECAUSE OF ITS STATUS, IT SHOULD NOT HAVE A PREROGATIVE THAT NO OTHER COMMITTEE HAS. IT CANNOT EVEN DO WHAT OTHER COMMITTEES DO. AND NOBODY SAW FIT TO GIVE THE COMMITTEE THAT STATUS AND THAT DIGNITY SO THAT IT COULD LEAVE IT AS A STEPCHILD AND THEN COME IN HERE AND TRY TO TACK SOMETHING ON HERE OR TACK SOMETHING ON THERE.

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE, SENATOR.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THIS IS WHAT I MEAN WHEN I SAY THAT WELL-INTENTIONED EFFORTS OFTEN ARE MORE HURTFUL, BECAUSE WHOEVER PUT THIS COMMITTEE INTO THE STATUTES HAD A GOOD MOTIVE, I PRESUME, BUT DID NOT FEEL STRONGLY ENOUGH TO PUT IT ON A PAR WITH THE OTHER COMMITTEES IN THE LEGISLATURE. SO I DEFINITELY INTEND TO VOTE NO. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR CHAMBERS. IS THERE ANYONE ELSE THAT WISHES TO SPEAK? SENATOR NORDQUIST, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR NORDQUIST: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS. I'M GOING TO RISE IN SUPPORT OF THE CHANGE. AS A MEMBER OF THE RULES COMMITTEE, WE TALKED THOROUGHLY ABOUT THIS PROPOSAL. IT ENDED UP, I BELIEVE, BEING A 4-1 VOTE IN SUPPORT OF IT. AND IT IS A SPECIAL COMMITTEE, MUCH LIKE THE PLANNING COMMITTEE, WHICH HAS A PRIORITY BILL DESIGNATION THAT WAS ADDED, OR NOT THE PLANNING COMMITTEE, THE PERFORMANCE AUDIT COMMITTEE, AND THAT HAS BEEN ADDED IN RECENT YEARS. WE THINK THAT, YOU KNOW, ULTIMATELY AT THE END OF THE SESSION IN MANY YEARS THERE WILL BE A LIMITED AMOUNT OF TIME, AND THE SPEAKER WILL HAVE TO USE HIS OR HER DISCRETION, EVEN AMONGST PRIORITY BILLS, OF WHICH ONES GET SCHEDULED. TYPICALLY IT GOES THE INDIVIDUAL SENATOR PRIORITY BILLS GET FIRST BITE AT THE APPLE, AND THEN STANDING COMMITTEES, AND THEN PROBABLY THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE. AND THE SPEAKER PRIORITIES ARE TOWARDS THE END OF THAT LIST. SO THIS WOULD ADD ONE MORE PRIORITY BILL TO THAT LIST. BUT WE THINK THAT THIS COMMITTEE DOES DEAL WITH VERY UNIQUE ISSUES

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

AND THAT THE CHAIR OF THAT COMMITTEE SHOULD HAVE THE ABILITY TO DESIGNATE ONE BILL AS A PRIORITY BILL FOR THAT COMMITTEE. THANK YOU.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR NORDQUIST. ANYONE ELSE WHO WISHES TO SPEAK? SEEING NONE, SENATOR GARRETT, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE ON THIS AMENDMENT. SENATOR GARRETT WAIVES CLOSING. THE QUESTION IS, SHALL THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT TO THE PERMANENT RULES, AMENDMENT TO RULE 5, BE ADOPTED? ALL THOSE IN FAVOR VOTE AYE; ALL THOSE OPPOSED VOTE NAY. THERE'S BEEN A REQUEST FOR A ROLL CALL VOTE. MR. CLERK, PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

CLERK: (ROLL CALL VOTE TAKEN.) 41 AYES, 2 NAYS, MR. PRESIDENT, ON THE ADOPTION OF THE PROPOSED RULES CHANGE.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, MR. CLERK. THE AMENDMENT IS ADOPTED. NEXT, SENATOR GARRETT, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON THE SECOND AMENDMENT.

CLERK: SENATOR, THIS IS THE AMENDMENT TO RULE 7, SECTION 3.

SENATOR GARRETT: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER. THIS RULE WAS BROUGHT BY SENATOR MURANTE. AND AT THIS POINT I'D LIKE TO YIELD THE TIME TO SENATOR MURANTE TO EXPLAIN HIS PROPOSED RULES CHANGE.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR MURANTE, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR MURANTE: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS. AND THANK YOU, SENATOR GARRETT. THIS RULES CHANGE IS PART OF AN ONGOING EFFORT THAT I HAVE BEEN CONDUCTING OVER THE LAST TWO YEARS TO CONFORM OUR RULE BOOK TO THE STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES OF THE LEGISLATURE. AS SOME OF THE MEMBERS MAY RECALL FROM LAST YEAR, THIS BODY DETERMINED THAT DURING DEBATE ON THE BUDGET BILL, THE BUDGET WAS INDIVISIBLE. IT COULD NOT BE DIVIDED INTO SECTIONS. SO NOTWITHSTANDING THE JUDGMENT OF THAT, THAT WAS THE PRECEDENT THAT WAS MADE AND THIS RULES CHANGE SIMPLY CODIFIES THAT DETERMINATION INTO THE RULE BOOK, WHICH IS TO SAY THAT THE BUDGET IS INDIVISIBLE AND CANNOT BE DIVIDED INTO SECTIONS UPON THE REQUEST OF A MEMBER OF THE LEGISLATURE. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR MURANTE. THE CHAIR RECOGNIZES SENATOR MELLO.

SENATOR MELLO: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

LEGISLATURE. I STAND IN SUPPORT OF SENATOR MURANTE'S RULE CHANGE IN RULE 7, SECTION 3. I SPOKE IN SUPPORT OF IT AT THE RULES COMMITTEE HEARING. IN PART, AS WHAT YOU JUST HEARD SENATOR MURANTE MENTION, LAST YEAR FOR THE FIRST TIME THAT SOMEONE CAN REMEMBER IN RECENT HISTORY, THERE WAS A MOTION TO DIVIDE THE QUESTION, WHICH THE QUESTION WAS THE BUDGET BILL IN WHICH ALL SENATORS THROUGH THE BUDGET PROCESS AND THROUGH OUR CURRENT RULES, SENATORS HAVE THE ABILITY TO INTRODUCE AMENDMENTS TO STRIKE OUT COMPONENTS OF THE BUDGET AND/OR ADD COMPONENTS INTO THE BUDGET BILLS. AND AS FAR AS WE CAN REMEMBER, THAT JUST HASN'T BEEN DONE, TO TRY TO MAKE THE LEGISLATURE TAKE A LINE-ITEM BY LINE-ITEM VOTE, WHICH WOULD HAVE OCCURRED LAST YEAR IF THE RULING WAS TO ALLOW THE BUDGET TO BE DIVIDED. THIS AMENDMENT SIMPLY CLARIFIES AND PUTS INTO OUR RULES WHAT THAT RULING WAS, WHICH OBVIOUSLY, AS THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE CHAIR, I THINK IT STREAMLINES OUR PROCESS. IT DOESN'T, ONCE AGAIN, IMPEDE ON ANY SENATOR OR THEIR ABILITY TO INTRODUCE AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET. IT SIMPLY MEANS THAT AS A MATTER OF PRACTICALITY, THE LEGISLATURE WILL NOT BE PUT IN A POSITION IN THE FUTURE TO HAVE TO DO A LINE-ITEM BY LINE-ITEM BY LINE-ITEM VOTE IN ANY OF THE MAIN BUDGET BILLS, WHETHER THAT'S THE MAINLINE BUDGET, WHETHER THAT'S THE DEFICIT BUDGET, OR ANY KIND OF FUND TRANSFERS, WHICH ALL OF THOSE BILLS COMPRISE, SO TO SPEAK, OF THE OVERALL BUDGET PROCESS. WITH THAT, I'D URGE THE BODY TO ADOPT THE AMENDMENT TO RULE 7, SECTION 3. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR MELLO. SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE. I AGREE WITH THAT PORTION OF WHAT SENATOR MELLO SAID AND WHAT THE RULE IS OFFERING. BUT I HOPE EVERYBODY HEARD THAT HE MENTIONED ALSO THAT ANY SENATOR CAN STILL OFFER ANY AMENDMENT HE OR SHE PLEASURES WITH REFERENCE TO THE BUDGET BILL. AND IF I DECIDE THAT I'M GOING TO USE THE BUDGET BILL TO KEEP US HERE THE REST OF WHATEVER REMAINS OF THE SESSION, I WILL DO IT BY SIMPLY OFFERING AN AMENDMENT TO EACH SECTION AND WE DISCUSS IT THAT WAY. BUT AS WAS POINTED OUT, IT'S NOT PRACTICAL TO TAKE A BILL THE SIZE OF THE BUDGET AND DIVIDE IT INTO EACH OF THE NUMEROUS SECTIONS AND TAKE EACH ONE. BUT WHAT I WANT TO ASK SENATOR MELLO, SINCE HE'S THE ONE EXPLAINING THE BILL, A QUESTION IF HE'LL ANSWER IT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR MELLO, WILL YOU ACCEPT QUESTIONS?

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

SENATOR MELLO: YES.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SENATOR MELLO, I SEE MENTIONED ALSO, "CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS SALARY BILL." WHY IS THAT INCLUDED?

SENATOR MELLO: SENATOR CHAMBERS, IN DISCUSSING WITH THE LEGISLATIVE FISCAL ANALYST, THAT IS A BILL THAT...WE JUST WANTED TO INCORPORATE THAT BILL FOR I THINK CONSISTENCY'S SAKE BECAUSE THAT BILL IS ALWAYS A BILL THE LEGISLATURE HAS TO PASS AND/OR INCORPORATE IN THE MAINLINE BUDGET BILL PROCESS. THE REALITY IS IT WOULD BE ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO...YOU CAN'T, SO TO SPEAK, DIVIDE THE QUESTION AS IT RELATES TO THE LEGISLATORS' SALARY. YOU COULD, IN THEORY I GUESS, TRY TO DIVIDE THE QUESTION ON EACH CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICER'S SALARY. BUT THE REALITY IS IT'S ALL ONE KIND OF...IT'S ALL ONE BILL. THEY'RE ALL LUMPED TOGETHER AS ALL CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS. AND SO IT'S JUST PART OF THE BUDGET PROCESS AND THE BUDGET, AS WE CALL IT IN THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, PART OF THE BUDGET TRAIN OF BILLS THAT ARE NECESSARY TO PASS THE MAINLINE BUDGET.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: JUST BETWEEN YOU AND ME, I NEVER LOOKED AT THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS SALARY BILL AS A PART OF THE BUDGET, MAYBE THE BUDGETING PROCESS. HOW MANY OFFICERS' SALARIES WOULD BE ENTAILED, ROUGHLY?

SENATOR MELLO: WELL, IT WOULD BE THE GOVERNOR, THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR, THE SECRETARY OF STATE, THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, THE STATE AUDITOR, THE STATE TREASURER, AND THE LEGISLATURE AS THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS. I'M SORRY, THE LEGISLATURE IS A SEPARATE BILL, I APOLOGIZE. IT WOULD BE THOSE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH THAT FALL IN THAT BILL.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I COUNTED SIX. MEMBERS OF THE...THANK YOU, SENATOR MELLO. MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, LEMMINGS, LEMMINGS, FOLLOW YOUR LEADERS. IN THE NAME OF CONSISTENCY, YOU ARE GOING TO SAY FOR THE PURPOSE OF OUR PROCESS A BILL COMPRISING SIX ELEMENTS CANNOT BE SUBJECTED TO A MOTION TO DIVIDE--SIX. I THINK THAT THAT PART OUGHT TO BE STRICKEN. SO WHILE YOU ALL ARE TALKING, IF ANYBODY DOES, I'M GOING TO OFFER AN AMENDMENT. AND BECAUSE I DON'T WANT A VOTE TAKEN BEFORE I OFFER THE AMENDMENT, I WANT TO STATE IT HERE. AND THAT AMENDMENT WILL BE TO STRIKE FROM THIS PROVISION, "CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS SALARY BILL." I WOULD LIKE TO ASK SENATOR MELLO A QUESTION.

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE, SENATOR.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SAY IT AGAIN.

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE, SENATOR.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: YES, MAY I ASK SENATOR MELLO A QUESTION?

SPEAKER HADLEY: YES. SENATOR MELLO, WILL YOU YIELD TO A QUESTION?

SENATOR MELLO: ABSOLUTELY.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SENATOR MELLO, WE COULD STRIKE, "CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS SALARY BILL," LEAVING ALL THESE BUDGET BILLS, INCLUDING THE FUNDS TRANSFER BILL, AND THERE WOULD BE AN INTEGRITY LEFT WITH REFERENCE TO THIS RULE, WOULDN'T THERE BE?

SENATOR MELLO: THERE COULD BE, SENATOR CHAMBERS. AND I HAVE MY LIGHT ON SO WE CAN CONTINUE THIS CONVERSATION ON MY TIME IF YOU'D LIKE. BUT I WAS GIVEN AN UPDATE. AND IT WAS MY MISTAKE OF NOT LEAVING...INCORPORATING IN THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS BILL, IT ALSO INCORPORATES THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION AND ALL JUDGES.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. YOU ANSWERED THE QUESTION, I THINK. WOULD THE INTEGRITY OF THIS AMENDMENT BE HARMED IF WE STRIKE, CONSTITUTIONAL...

SPEAKER HADLEY: TIME, SENATOR.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...OFFICERS SALARY BILL? THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR MELLO, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR MELLO: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE. AND JUST TO CLARIFY THAT AGAIN, THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS BILL DOES NOT ONLY INCLUDE THE SIX EXECUTIVE BRANCH CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS AND THEIR SALARIES, IT ALSO INCLUDES ALL JUDGES' SALARIES AS WELL AS MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION. AND SO I THINK, TO SOME EXTENT, SENATOR CHAMBERS' LOGIC AS IT RELATES TO THIS SPECIFIC BILL AS PART OF THE BUDGET PROCESS AND ARGUABLY THE BUDGET BILLS, I THINK IT NEEDS TO BE INCORPORATED, UNLESS WE WANT TO ALLOW THE LEGISLATURE, ONCE

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

AGAIN, TO BE ABLE TO DIVIDE INDIVIDUAL OFFICES AND INDIVIDUAL CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS, JUDGES, PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION MEMBERS. IF WE WANT TO BE ABLE TO HAVE TO TAKE A LINE-ITEM VOTE ON EACH ONE OF THEIR SALARIES, THEN WE WOULD STRIKE THIS COMPONENT OF THE RULES CHANGE. AS FAR AS MY TIME IN THE LEGISLATURE, THE SIX YEARS I'VE BEEN HERE, THE ISSUE OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS' SALARY HAS NEVER BEEN ONE OF DEBATE. IT'S NEVER BEEN ONE OF MUCH CONTENTION BECAUSE WE KNOW IT'S SOMETHING THE LEGISLATURE HAS TO INCORPORATE THROUGH THE CONSTITUTION AS PART OF OUR BUDGET PROCESS AND ULTIMATELY FUND DUE TO THE CONSTITUTION. SO I CAN APPRECIATE SENATOR CHAMBERS WANTING TO STRIKE THAT COMPONENT BASED ON MY PREVIOUS ANSWER OF IT ONLY IMPACTING SIX CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS BUT REALLY IT'S IMPACTING THE MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION AS WELL AS ALL THE JUDGES THROUGH THE SUPREME COURT, DISTRICT JUDGES THAT ALSO ARE INCORPORATED AS PART OF THAT SALARY SINCE THEY ARE ALSO DEEMED AS CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS THROUGH THE BUDGET PROCESS. SO WITH THAT, HOPEFULLY, SENATOR CHAMBERS, THAT MAY ANSWER AND CLARIFY, I SHOULD SAY, THE ANSWER I GAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY. AND I WOULD YIELD THE REMAINDER OF MY TIME TO SENATOR CHAMBERS.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE YIELDED 3:10.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. AND MY AMENDMENT IS DRAFTED, BUT HERE'S SOMETHING THAT I WANT TO CLARIFY. AND I'LL NEED SENATOR MELLO'S HELP. SENATOR MELLO, WHEN WE TALK ABOUT THE SALARY FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION, WE CANNOT SAY ONE COMMISSIONER WILL BE GIVEN A HIGHER SALARY THAN ANYBODY ELSE, CAN WE?

SENATOR MELLO: YOU ARE CORRECT.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SO THAT'S ONE VOTE. AREN'T THE JUDGES' SALARIES PEGGED TO THE SALARY OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE AND THEN WE GRADUATE DOWNWARD...OR UPWARD...DOWNWARD FROM THAT THE SALARY FOR THE JUDGES AT THE OTHER LEVELS?

SENATOR MELLO: SENATOR CHAMBERS, I AM NOT AS FAMILIAR WITH THE JUDGES' SALARIES PROCESS AND THE STAIR-STEPPING OF HOW IT'S BASED AS MUCH ON THE CHIEF JUSTICE BECAUSE NORMALLY THOSE BILLS DO NOT COME THROUGH APPROPRIATIONS. THEY GO THROUGH THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, AS ALL JUDGES' SALARY BILLS TRADITIONALLY HAVE GONE.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: BUT THERE WOULD BE THE SUPREME COURT, THE

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

APPELLATE COURT, THE DISTRICT COURT, THE COUNTY COURT, THE JUVENILE COURT.

SENATOR MELLO: CORRECT.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: WHICHEVER COURT THAT'S...

SENATOR MELLO: CORRECT.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: OH, I THOUGHT HE SAID TIME. WHICHEVER COURT IS BEING DEALT WITH, YOU CANNOT SINGLE OUT ANY JUDGE WHO IS A MEMBER OF THAT COURT FOR SPECIAL CONSIDERATION. SO YOU STILL ARE DEALING WITH A BILL THAT DOESN'T HAVE THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THESE OTHERS THAT CANNOT BE DIVIDED. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR CHAMBERS. THE CHAIR RECOGNIZES SENATOR NORDQUIST.

SENATOR NORDQUIST: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS. AND TO PUT IT INTO THE LEGISLATIVE RECORD FOR HISTORICAL PURPOSES, SENATOR KINTNER CAME OVER AND JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE EVERYONE KNEW THIS SHOULD BE NAMED THE "KINTNER RULE" FROM LAST YEAR. SO WE'LL GET THAT INTO THE RECORD SO EVERYONE KNOWS. AND I WANT TO THANK SENATOR MURANTE FOR BRINGING THIS AND FOR HIS WILLINGNESS TO PUT INTO RULE WHAT HAS BEEN ADOPTED PRACTICE IN THE BODY. AS FAR AS SENATOR CHAMBERS' PROPOSED AMENDMENT, I DON'T THINK THE IMPACT OF IT IS SIGNIFICANT. I DO THINK THAT IT MAKES SENSE THOUGH TO HOLD THE BILLS THAT TYPICALLY FLOW IN THE BUDGET PACKAGE OF BILLS TOGETHER UNDER THIS RULE. AS YOU'LL SEE WHEN WE GO THROUGH THE BUDGET PROCESS, THESE BILLS--THE MAINLINE BUDGET BILL, THE FUNDS TRANSFER BILL, THE DEFICIT BILL, AND THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS BILL, SALARY BILL--ALWAYS TRAVEL TOGETHER AS A PACKAGE. I THINK IT MAKES SENSE TO HAVE A SIMILAR RULE GOVERNING ALL OF THEM. AND AGAIN, THE SAME THING APPLIES. YOU HAVE THE ABILITY AS A LEGISLATOR TO RUN AS MANY AMENDMENTS TO THOSE BILLS, TO THOSE SECTIONS OF THOSE BILLS, STRIKING THOSE SECTIONS, CHANGING THOSE SECTIONS. YOU HAVE ESSENTIALLY UNLIMITED ABILITY TO DO THAT. I'M SURE SENATOR MELLO WOULD PROBABLY PREFER YOU DIDN'T DO THAT, BUT YOU CERTAINLY HAVE THE ABILITY TO DO THAT. SO I WILL NOT SUPPORT SENATOR CHAMBERS' CHANGE. THIS WAS A CHANGE COMING OUT OF THE RULES COMMITTEE UNANIMOUSLY. AND WE WORKED, WE ACTUALLY WITHHELD THE VOTE UNTIL WE GOT THE LANGUAGE FROM THE CLERK'S OFFICE WORKING WITH THE FISCAL OFFICE TO MAKE SURE WE IDENTIFIED

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

THE PACKAGE OF BILLS THAT FLOW WITH THE BUDGET. THANK YOU.

SPEAKER HADLEY: (VISITORS INTRODUCED.) MR. CLERK.

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, I HAVE AN AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED RULES CHANGE. SENATOR CHAMBERS WOULD MOVE TO AMEND THE RULE 7, SECTION 3, BY STRIKING THE LANGUAGE, "THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS SALARY BILL," FROM THE PROPOSED CHANGE.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON YOUR AMENDMENT.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE. SOME YEARS AGO, A MOVIE WAS MADE TITLED A MAN FOR ALL SEASONS ABOUT SIR THOMAS MORE. AND THE LEAD WAS PLAYED BY AN ACTOR NAMED PAUL SCOFIELD. THERE WAS A SCENE WHERE THE PERSON PORTRAYING SIR THOMAS MORE WAS CONFRONTING A PANEL OF PEOPLE WHO WERE TRYING TO GET HIM TO SIGN SOME KIND OF PETITION THAT WOULD LET THE KING DO SOME THINGS THAT THE KING WANTED TO DO THAT SIR THOMAS FELT SHOULDN'T BE DONE. AND THERE WAS A DUKE SITTING ON THIS PANEL AND HE WAS A FRIEND TO SIR THOMAS MORE. HE SAID, SIR THOMAS, SIGN IT. IT DOESN'T MEAN ANYTHING. I'VE SIGNED IT. FOR GOODNESS SAKE--HE USED A DIFFERENT WORD--FOR GOODNESS SAKE, EVERYBODY HAS SIGNED IT. HE SAID, WELL, WHY DO YOU NEED ME TO SIGN IT? HE SAID WORDS TO THE EFFECT, WELL, NOT ONLY ARE YOU A GOOD MAN, BUT YOU'RE PERCEIVED TO BE A GOOD MAN. SIGN IT, SIR THOMAS, FOR FELLOWSHIP SAKE. AND THE PERSON PORTRAYING THOMAS MORE...IT WAS A LONG TIME THAT I SAW THE MOVIE, BUT IT SEEMS LIKE IT WENT SOMETHING LIKE THIS. YOU TELL ME TO SIGN THIS FOR FELLOWSHIP SAKE. YOU SIGNED IT AND IT DOES NOT VIOLATE YOUR CONSCIENCE. I SIGN IT, IT VIOLATES MY CONSCIENCE. BECAUSE IT DIDN'T VIOLATE YOUR CONSCIENCE, WHEN TIME COMES TO BE JUDGED, YOU GO TO HEAVEN. I HAVE SIGNED IT, I VIOLATED MY CONSCIENCE SO I GO TO HELL. WILL YOU ACCOMPANY ME TO HELL FOR FELLOWSHIP SAKE? MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, SOMETIMES I THINK IT MIGHT BE GOOD TO DEFER TO WHAT THE RULES COMMITTEE MIGHT BRING IF IT'S AN INCONSEQUENTIAL ITEM. THE REASON I THINK THIS ITEM IS CONSEQUENTIAL, NOT BECAUSE A PERSON CANNOT OFFER AN INDIVIDUAL AMENDMENT TO EACH ONE OF THESE CATEGORIES OF OFFICERS OR THE INDIVIDUAL OFFICER WHO WILL BE CONSIDERED FOR A CHANGE IN SALARY, IT'S JUST THAT THIS BILL DOES NOT FIT WITH ALL THESE OTHERS THAT THEY CAN GIVE A PERSUASIVE ARGUMENT AS TO WHY YOU SHOULD NOT LET THEM BE SUBJECT TO THE MOTION TO DIVIDE THE QUESTION, WHICH MEANS DIVIDE A BILL INTO ALL OF THE PARTS THAT CAN STAND ALONE. AT MOST, SENATOR

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

MELLO GAVE US SIX. HE MENTIONED THE JUDGES. I SAY THAT WOULD BE SEVEN. HE MENTIONED THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION. THAT WOULD BE EIGHT. THAT IS NOT TOO HEAVY A BURDEN FOR THIS LEGISLATURE TO CARRY. IT IS CORRECT THAT GENERALLY THE MATTER OF SALARIES FOR CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS DOES NOT RAISE MUCH IN THE WAY OF DISCUSSION. IS THAT WHY WE SHOULD CHANGE THE RULES? I DON'T THINK IT IS. AND THE REASON THE GOVERNOR AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL AND SOME OF THOSE OTHER PEOPLE GOT A SALARY INCREASE, WHICH YOU ALL WON'T KNOW, IS BECAUSE I GOT THE BILL PASSED, MAY HAVE EVEN OVERRIDDEN A GOVERNOR'S VETO. AND AT THAT TIME, I DID NOT LIKE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL. I DID NOT LIKE THE GOVERNOR. I MAY NOT HAVE LIKED ANY OF THEM. BUT MY PRINCIPLE WAS THIS: AN OFFICE HAS A CERTAIN NUMBER OF DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES. THERE IS WHAT YOU CAN CALL A CERTAIN DIGNITY ATTACHED TO THAT OFFICE, AND ANNEXED TO THAT OFFICE, BECAUSE OF ITS DIGNITY AND THE DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES, SHOULD BE A SALARY COMMENSURATE WITH THOSE CONSIDERATIONS. AND IN THIS SOCIETY, THE VALUE OF MANY THINGS ARE DETERMINED BY THE AMOUNT OF REMUNERATION OR SALARY OR COMPENSATION THE ONE HOLDING THAT POSITION WILL RECEIVE. SO IF YOU OFFER A PALTRY SALARY, THE LEGISLATURE IS SAYING THIS OFFICE IS NOT VERY IMPORTANT. AND THAT WAS THE ARGUMENT, BASICALLY, THAT I USED TO GET SALARY INCREASES FOR MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH WHOM I DID NOT LIKE. THERE ARE TIMES WHEN OUR PERSONAL LIKES AND DISLIKES HAVE TO BE TRANSCENDED, TRUMPED, OR SET ASIDE BECAUSE THERE ARE SOME MATTERS THAT ARE MORE IMPORTANT FOR US TO LOOK AT AS MEMBERS OF THE LAWMAKING BODY. AND THIS BILL THAT IS BEING PUT WITH THESE OTHERS OUGHT NOT BE THERE. I CAN SEE FROM THE VOTE BEFORE THAT THE LEMMINGS ARE GOING TO PREVAIL. BUT I WANT THE RECORD TO BE CLEAR ON THE POSITION I TOOK. AND JUST BY COINCIDENCE, I SHARED WITH MY COLLEAGUES ON THE EXECUTIVE BOARD SOME COURT RULINGS ON AN ABORTION BILL WHICH PASSED THE LEGISLATURE 45-1. I WAS THE ONE THAT SAID NO. AND IT JUST HAPPENED THAT THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT, THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, AND THE U.S. SUPREME COURT AGREED WITH ME. AND THEY STRUCK THE BILL DOWN AS UNCONSTITUTIONAL. YOU DON'T HAVE TO ALWAYS GO ALONG JUST BECAUSE A COMMITTEE SENDS SOMETHING OUT HERE OR JUST BECAUSE SIX PEOPLE OR HOWEVER MANY PEOPLE ARE ON THAT COMMITTEE SAID, BECAUSE WE SAY IT SHOULD BE THIS WAY, IT SHOULD BE THIS WAY. IF I READ AN EDITORIAL IN THE NEWSPAPER, THAT'S ONE PERSON'S OPINION OR A SMALL EDITORIAL BOARD'S OPINION. THESE ARE JUST PEOPLE. THEY ARE NOT MORE EXPERT. THEY ARE NOT WISER. THEY ARE NOT MORE INTELLIGENT. THEY DO NOT HAVE ACCESS TO INFORMATION THAT WE CANNOT OBTAIN ENOUGH INFORMATION ABOUT TO FORM AN INDEPENDENT DECISION. BUT

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

LEGISLATIVE BODIES ARE MUCH LIKE OTHERS. NOW I REFER TO COLONEL GARRETT AS "GENERAL." I KNOW THAT "SERGEANT" SEILER WAS ALSO IN THE ARMY AND SOME OTHERS. BUT WE KNOW THAT WHEN THEY LINE YOU UP AND TELL YOU FORWARD MARCH, YOU MARCH, EVERYBODY DOES, AND YOU STEP OFF ON THE LEFT FOOT. AND IF YOU MAKE A MISTAKE AND STEP OFF ON THE RIGHT FOOT, THEY EMBARRASS YOU BY SAYING THE OTHER LEFT FOOT. THIS IS NOT A REGIMENTED BODY LIKE MILITARY WHEN YOU THINK OF IT IN TERMS OF WHAT ROLE AND FUNCTION IT IS TO SERVE. YOU WILL HEAR PEOPLE TALK ABOUT THE LEGISLATURE AS COMPRISING 49 STRONG-WILLED--FALSE, INDEPENDENT--FALSE, INTELLIGENT--CERTAINLY FALSE, PEOPLE. THAT'S NOT TRUE. I'VE BEEN HERE 40 YEARS, 4-0, F-O-R-T-Y, 40 YEARS, AND I'VE HAD A CHANCE TO OBSERVE SESSION AFTER SESSION OF LEGISLATURES, TENS AND TENS OF LEGISLATORS. AND IT'S LIKE MOST ORGANIZATIONS WHEN THEY MIGHT CALL TOGETHER A MEETING TO TALK ABOUT LEADERSHIP. AND YOU KNOW WHAT IT BOILS DOWN TO? ONE PERSON ASSERTING HIS OR HER WILL AND ALL OF THE OTHER WOULD-BE LEADERS FOLLOWING. SO YOU WILL FOLLOW. THE VOTE WILL NOT GO MY WAY. BUT I DON'T EVEN CARE. IN A WAY I DO, BECAUSE NOT JUST THE WORLD BUT THE SENATORS WILL LITTLE NOTE, NOR LONG REMEMBER, WHAT WE SAY OR DO HERE. BECAUSE SOMEBODY IS GOING TO MAKE A MOTION THAT IS CONTRARY TO WHAT THIS RULE SAYS, BECAUSE THEY DON'T REMEMBER. AND I'M TRYING TO FOCUS ATTENTION ON WHAT WE'RE DOING WHILE WE'RE DOING IT SO I CAN MOCK YOU. I CAN SCOFF AT YOU. I CAN WRITE A RHYME EXPRESSING SCORN, RIDICULE. THAT'S WHERE I THRIVE, IN THE SAME WAY THAT EDGAR ALLAN POE THRIVED IN THE REALM...

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE, SENATOR.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...OF HORROR, MYSTERY, INTRIGUE. AND BY THE WAY, SOME PEOPLE DON'T KNOW IT BUT EDGAR ALLAN POE WAS THE FATHER OF THE DETECTIVE STORY. AND IN FRANCE, THEY LIONIZED EDGAR ALLAN POE. PEOPLE IN THIS COUNTRY, SOME PEOPLE LIKE WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW OR WHOEVER THOSE PEOPLE ARE, CALLED HIM THE JINGLE MAN BECAUSE HE DID THINGS WITH LANGUAGE THAT THEY COULD NOT DO. SO RATHER THAN RAISE THEIR ABILITY TO HIS LEVEL, THEY WANTED TO DUMB DOWN WHAT HE WAS DOING TO THEIR LEVEL OF IGNORANCE. BUT YOU'VE HEARD MY OPENING. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR CHAMBERS. THE CHAIR RECOGNIZES SENATOR MURANTE.

SENATOR MURANTE: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS. GOOD MORNING. I'M GOING TO RISE IN SUPPORT OF THE CHAMBERS AMENDMENT

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

AND I HAVE A COUPLE OF REASONS FOR THAT. FIRST OF ALL, AS I MENTIONED IN MY INTRODUCTION, WHEN I BROUGHT THIS RULES CHANGE TO THE RULES COMMITTEE, MY INTENT WAS TO CODIFY INTO THE RULE BOOK THE STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES THAT WE ESTABLISHED LAST YEAR DURING THE BUDGET DEBATE. ACCORDINGLY, WHEN I INTRODUCED THE RULES CHANGE AS I DRAFTED IT, THE ONLY LANGUAGE THAT WAS CONTAINED IN IT WAS THAT THE MAINLINE BUDGET BILL WAS NOT DIVISIBLE. THE RULES COMMITTEE, BY AMENDMENT, ADDED THE DEFICIT BILL, THE CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION BILL, THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS SALARY BILL, AND THE FUNDS TRANSFER BILL, WHICH WAS NOT MY INTENT. THAT GOES BEYOND CODIFYING INTO OUR RULE BOOK PRECEDENCE AND ESTABLISHING ANEW, WHICH IS THEIR PREROGATIVE AS A RULES COMMITTEE, BUT ESTABLISHES NEW RULES, WHICH WAS ABOVE AND BEYOND WHAT I WAS ATTEMPTING TO DO. BUT SPECIFICALLY WITH RESPECT TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS SALARY BILL, IT'S IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT I BELIEVE THE INTENT OF THE LANGUAGE HERE IS TO APPLY ONLY TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS SALARY BILL WHICH IS CONTAINED IN THE BUDGET AND IS REPORTED OUT BY THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE. HOWEVER, IN ORDER TO CHANGE THE SALARY OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS, A SEPARATE BILL, DISTINCT FROM THE BUDGET BILLS WHICH GO TO THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, HAVE TO BE INTRODUCED. THEY'RE REFERENCED TO THE GOVERNMENT, MILITARY AND VETERANS AFFAIRS COMMITTEE WHERE WE HAVE A PUBLIC HEARING AND VOTE ON IT AS SUCH. I AM NOT SURE WHETHER THE BILL, WHICH OVER THE PAST FEW YEARS HAS BEEN INTRODUCED BY SENATOR AVERY, WHETHER THIS RULES CHANGE THAT WE ARE DISCUSSING RIGHT NOW APPLIES TO THAT BILL, WHETHER THE BILL TO INCREASE THE SALARY FOR CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS WOULD NO LONGER BECOME DIVISIBLE. AS SENATOR CHAMBERS SAID, THE RATIONALE DURING THE BUDGET DEBATE LAST YEAR FOR MAKING THE BUDGET INDIVISIBLE WAS THAT HAVING HUNDREDS OF SECTIONS THAT WE HAD TO VOTE ON ONE BY ONE WOULD LITERALLY TAKE WEEKS OF OUR TIME TO ACCOMPLISH. THE HANDFUL OF VOTES THAT IT WOULD TAKE TO PASS OR AMEND THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS SALARY BILL IN THE BUDGET WOULD TAKE VERY LITTLE TIME AT ALL UNLESS THERE WAS SIGNIFICANT DEBATE ON THE SUBJECT. SO THERE'S...WE DON'T HAVE THAT RATIONALE. AND I'M NOT ENTIRELY CLEAR WHETHER THE BILL, WHICH TRADITIONALLY GOES TO THE GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE WHICH RAISES THE SALARY OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS, MEETS THE DEFINITION OF THIS CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS SALARY BILL. I UNDERSTAND THAT IT'S WITHIN THE CONTEXT, AND EVERY OTHER BILL THAT'S LISTED IS WITHIN THE CONTEXT, OF THE BUDGET THAT'S REPORTED OUT BY THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE. BUT IT'S NOT CLEAR ENOUGH TO ME THAT A BILL WHICH I ASSUME WILL BE COMING THIS YEAR TO RAISE THE SALARY OF

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS APPLIES TO THIS PARTICULAR SECTION. SO UNTIL THAT CLARIFICATION IS MADE, I THINK I AM GOING TO SUPPORT THE AMENDMENT BY SENATOR CHAMBERS. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR MURANTE. NEXT, THE CHAIR RECOGNIZES SENATOR MELLO.

SENATOR MELLO: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE. A LIT BIT MORE BACKGROUND AND HISTORY A LITTLE BIT IN RESPECTS TO THE UNDERLYING ISSUE. IF YOU LOOK AT LB197, WHICH WAS THE MAINLINE BUDGET BILL PROCESS, SO TO SPEAK, LAST YEAR, IT WAS A SPECIFIC BILL THAT RELATES TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS' SALARY. THERE ARE ACTUALLY MORE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS, QUOTE UNQUOTE, THAN SIMPLY THE EXECUTIVE OFFICERS WE DISCUSSED AS WELL AS THE VARIOUS BRANCHES WITHIN THE COURT SYSTEM THAT SENATOR CHAMBERS MENTIONED AND THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION. IF YOU LOOK AT LB197 FROM 2013, THERE'S 23 SECTIONS OF THE BILL. SIXTEEN SECTIONS RELATE TO SPECIFIC CONSTITUTIONAL SALARY ISSUES. I'LL READ THROUGH THEM QUICKLY JUST TO PROVIDE I THINK A MORE...A LARGER CONTEXT OF WHO WE'RE ALL TALKING ABOUT BESIDES SOME THAT WERE MENTIONED EARLIER. SUPREME COURT JUDGES' SALARY, THE COURT OF APPEALS JUDGES' SALARIES, RETIRED JUDGES' SALARIES, DISTRICT AND JUVENILE COURT JUDGES' SALARIES, COUNTY JUDGE SALARIES, GOVERNOR, LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR, SECRETARY OF STATE, THE AUDITOR, ATTORNEY GENERAL, STATE TREASURER, THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSIONERS, THE BOARD OF PAROLE, THE TAX COMMISSIONER IN THE DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, ALSO THE WORKERS' COMPENSATION COURT JUDGES' SALARIES AND THE WORKERS' COMPENSATION COURT RETIRED AND ACTING JUDGES' SALARIES. SO IT'S MORE...I THINK GOING BACK TO SENATOR CHAMBERS' LOGIC AND THE GENERAL PREMISE IS THAT THIS IS NOT SIMPLY AFFECTING SIX CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS THAT RESIDE IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH. IT OBVIOUSLY AFFECTS 16 SPECIFIC COMPONENTS THAT ARE LISTED OUT IN THE CONSTITUTION THAT ARE ALL COMBINED WITHIN THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS SALARY BILL. IT ALSO...IT SHOULDN'T GO WITHOUT NOTICE THAT THESE ARE ALL LISTED IN THE CONSTITUTION. AND WHILE, FOR AN EXAMPLE, THE GOVERNOR CAN CHANGE THE ACTUAL SALARY OF THE TAX COMMISSIONER, CAN CHANGE THE ACTUAL SALARY OF A BOARD OF PAROLE MEMBER, THEIR SALARY ITSELF THOUGH IS DONE...OR THEIR SALARY POSITION IS IN THE CONSTITUTIONAL. THAT IS WHY THEY RESIDE IN THE CONSTITUTIONAL SALARIES BILL. THERE IS ALSO GENERALLY...I CAN APPRECIATE SENATOR MURANTE'S CONCERN, WHERE IF THERE IS A CHANGE IN STATUTE THAT AFFECTS WHERE THAT CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS' SALARY IS, THAT BILL DOESN'T GO THROUGH THE APPROPRIATIONS

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

COMMITTEE BECAUSE IT'S A STATUTORY CHANGE. THIS BILL SIMPLY APPROPRIATES THE MONEY ACCORDING TO STATUTE FOR THESE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS WHICH ARE LISTED IN THE CONSTITUTION. THIS UNDERLYING ISSUE I THINK THAT SENATOR CHAMBERS HAS RAISED, IT DOESN'T CAUSE ME GREAT HEARTBURN. IT'S STILL, I THINK, IT'S CONSISTENT WITH REGARDS TO WHAT WE SEE AS THE BUDGET PROCESS AND ARGUABLY BILLS THAT MAKE UP THE MAINLINE BUDGET BILL. IF THIS AMENDMENT GETS ADOPTED, WILL THIS ULTIMATELY CHANGE I THINK THE OUTCOME OF MAKING SURE THAT THE BUDGET DOES NOT GET...CANNOT BE DIVIDED? PROBABLY NOT. I THINK IT REMAINS...I THINK IT SHOULD REMAIN BECAUSE IT PROVIDES SOME CONSISTENCY IN REGARDS TO WHAT WE HAD DISCUSSED IN THE RULES COMMITTEE AND ULTIMATELY WHAT I HAD DISCUSSED WITH OTHER MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE WHO WANTED TO SEE THIS RULE ADOPTED, THAT THE BILLS THAT ARE PART OF THE BUDGET PROCESS--NORMALLY THERE'S ANYWHERE BETWEEN FIVE TO SEVEN BILLS--CANNOT BE DIVIDED. AND I DON'T THINK THERE'S AN INCONSISTENCY UNDERSTANDING THAT IF A BILL THAT SENATOR MURANTE WANTS TO INTRODUCE THAT INCREASES THE GOVERNOR'S SALARY IN STATUTE, ARGUABLY THAT'S GOING BE ONE BILL SUBJECT MATTER ANYWAY DEALING WITH SALARIES. THE SAME THING WITH JUDGES' SALARIES, IF THERE WAS A BILL THAT CHANGED JUDGES' SALARIES, THAT'S A ONE-SUBJECT BILL ALSO. THE REALITY IS WE CAN CHANGE THE RULES. IF PEOPLE WANT TO TRY TO MAKE A MOTION TO AMEND THOSE BILLS AND INCORPORATE OTHER PIECES OF LEGISLATION INTO IT, THAT'S A DECISION THAT THIS BODY ULTIMATELY GETS TO DECIDE ONE WAY OR ANOTHER ULTIMATELY THROUGH A RULING OF THE CHAIR IF THERE'S AN AMENDMENT BROUGHT FORWARD. BUT I DON'T TAKE SENATOR CHAMBERS' AMENDMENT...

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE, SENATOR.

SENATOR MELLO: ...I DON'T TAKE SENATOR CHAMBERS' AMENDMENT AS ONE THAT IS A THREATENING AMENDMENT. I THINK TO SOME EXTENT, I THINK THE REALITY IS TRYING TO BE CONSISTENT WITH ALL OF THE BUDGET BILLS IS MY INTENT OF WHY I SUPPORTED WHAT SENATOR MURANTE WANTED TO DO OF ENSURING THAT THE BUDGET BILLS ARE NOT DIVISIBLE. THE REALITY IS IF THIS GETS TAKEN OUT, THEN, YES, WHEN WE COME UP WITH A BUDGET BILL THIS YEAR THAT HAS THE CONSTITUTIONAL SALARIES THAT I DISCUSSED, THE 16 SEPARATE SECTIONS, A SENATOR COULD POSSIBLY MOVE TO DIVIDE THAT QUESTION AND THE LEGISLATURE THEN WOULD HAVE TO TAKE A VOTE ON EVERY SECTION OF THAT BILL. I GENUINELY DON'T THINK WE NEED TO DO THAT BECAUSE SENATORS STILL HAVE THE ABILITY TO INTRODUCE AMENDMENTS, IF THEY SO CHOOSE TO, TO STRIKE CERTAIN SECTIONS OR CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS AS PART OF THE UNDERLYING BILL. WITH THAT

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

SAID, I RESPECTFULLY AM GOING TO HAVE TO OPPOSE SENATOR CHAMBERS' AMENDMENT. IF IT DOES PASS, WE'LL CROSS THAT BRIDGE IF AND WHEN WE GET THERE. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THE CHAIR RECOGNIZES SENATOR BOLZ.

SENATOR BOLZ: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I RISE IN SUPPORT OF THE RULES CHANGE AS ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE AND MAINLY FOR THIS PURPOSE. OUR EXISTING RULES, RULE 7, SECTION 11, STATES THAT, "MOTIONS AND AMENDMENTS SHALL NOT BE FILED FOR DILATORY PURPOSES." AND I THINK THAT DIVIDING THE BUDGET IN THIS MANNER WOULD BE A DILATORY STRATEGY. AND I THINK IT'S PARTICULARLY IMPORTANT FOR THE PACKAGE OF BUDGET BILLS TO MOVE FORWARD AND HANG TOGETHER BECAUSE WE CAN'T DO THE OTHER BUSINESS OF THIS BODY UNTIL THE BUDGET BILLS PASS. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE. SENATOR BOLZ BROUGHT UP ONE OF THE MOST MEANINGLESS RULES YOU CAN HAVE. WHO'S GOING TO READ MY MIND AND SAY WHY I'M OFFERING AN AMENDMENT? AND WHO'S GOING TO TELL ME, SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU CAN'T OFFER THAT AMENDMENT? STUFF IS IN THE RULE BOOKS NOW THAT CANNOT BE ENFORCED AND I'M TRYING TO TELL YOU ALL SOMETHING WHILE WE'RE WORKING ON THE RULES. I HAVE FOUGHT AGAINST PUTTING NONSENSE INTO THE CONSTITUTION, SUCH AS "FISHING, HUNTING, AND TRAPPING." NO SENATOR WILL PERSUADE THIS LEGISLATURE TO PROHIBIT FISHING, HUNTING, AND TRAPPING. AND I SAID, DON'T BEFOUL THE CONSTITUTION BY PUTTING STUFF IN IT THAT DOESN'T NEED TO BE THERE TO MAKE A POINT OR BECAUSE THEY DID IT IN MINNESOTA. THE RULE BOOK SHOULD BE AS SPARSE AS POSSIBLE. IF WE ARE GOING TO PUT SOMETHING INTO THE RULE BOOK TO COVER A SITUATION THAT HAS NEVER...MR. PRESIDENT, I'D LIKE TO ASK SENATOR MELLO A QUESTION.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR MELLO, WILL YOU YIELD TO A QUESTION?

SENATOR MELLO: OF COURSE.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'VE DISCOVERED THAT WHAT I SAY IS NOT RESPECTED AND NOT BELIEVED. SO I'M GOING ASK A QUESTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE. SENATOR MELLO, SINCE YOU'VE BEEN IN THE LEGISLATURE, HOW MANY TIMES WERE BILLS OFFERED OF THE KIND WE'RE TALKING ABOUT HERE WHEN WE SAY THE SALARY FOR

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS?

SENATOR MELLO: WELL, FIRST OFF, SENATOR CHAMBERS, I DON'T BELIEVE YOU'RE CORRECT. I THINK SOME MEMBERS DO LISTEN TO YOU AND SOME MEMBERS DO RESPECT YOU WHEN YOU MAKE COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS OR MAKE ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OR OPPOSITION TO LEGISLATION.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: OH, THAT MAKES MY BURDEN A LITTLE LIGHTER TODAY. BUT STILL, WOULD YOU ANSWER THAT QUESTION, PLEASE?

SENATOR MELLO: THE QUESTION: I BELIEVE SENATOR AVERY, SENATOR AVERY HAD INTRODUCED BILLS BEFORE AND I'M TRYING TO RECOLLECT, HE MAY HAVE INTRODUCED THEM TWICE THAT WOULD HAVE INCREASED THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS' SALARY FOR THE GOVERNOR, LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR, TREASURER, AUDITOR, ATTORNEY GOVERNOR, AND STATE TREASURER. AND I BELIEVE IN THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, IT'S ALSO BEEN INTRODUCED BEFORE BY MULTIPLE SENATORS, I BELIEVE, TO INCREASE JUDGES' SALARIES DIFFERING PERCENTAGES.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: NOT TO BE RUDE BUT TO HELP US, I SHOULDN'T HAVE ASKED HOW MANY. I SHOULD HAVE MADE IT MORE GENERAL. A BILL OF THIS KIND THAT THIS RULE IS DEALING WITH HAS BEEN INTRODUCED AND ENACTED NUMEROUS TIMES SINCE YOU'VE BEEN IN THE LEGISLATURE, CORRECT?

SENATOR MELLO: THE BILL THAT WE'RE DISCUSSING THAT'S PART OF THE BUDGET PROCESS HAS BEEN INTRODUCED THREE TIMES SINCE I'VE BEEN IN THE LEGISLATURE. AND IT'S PASSED ALL THREE TIMES BECAUSE IT APPROPRIATES THE MONEY TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS PER STATE STATUTE.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: HOW MANY TIMES HAS ANYBODY MADE A MOTION TO DIVIDE THE QUESTION ON THAT SALARY BILL?

SENATOR MELLO: NONE.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, IT HAS NOT HAPPENED. WILL YOU HELP...WOULD YOU PUT INTO THE RULES THAT NO SENATOR SHALL BE ALLOWED TO MAKE IT FROM ONE PART OF THE CHAMBER TO THE OTHER BY WALKING ON TOP OF THE DESKS? IT'S NEVER HAPPENED. WHY DON'T YOU PUT IT THE RULE BOOK BECAUSE SOMEBODY MIGHT? NO SENATOR SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO CRAWL ON HIS BELLY...WELL, SOMETIMES THE LOBBYISTS MAKE SENATORS FIGURATIVELY CRAWL ON THEIR BELLY

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

WHEN THEY'RE MAKING IT TO THE TROUGH. BUT WHY UNNECESSARILY LENGTHEN THE RULE BOOK? YOU TALK TO ME ABOUT ALL THESE BUSINESS PEOPLE WHO CAME HERE,...

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE, SENATOR.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...HOW INTELLIGENT THESE NEW SENATORS ARE. AND THE FIRST THING THEY DO IS START ADDING THINGS TO THE RULE BOOK TO ADDRESS SUBJECTS WHERE IT HAS NOT ARISEN, BUT IT MIGHT. THE SUN TOMORROW MIGHT RISE IN THE WEST AND SET IN THE EAST. THE MOON MAY FALL. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR MELLO, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR MELLO: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE. AND, YES, SENATOR CHAMBERS' LOGIC IS CORRECT THAT IN THE THREE YEARS...OR THE SIX YEARS I'VE BEEN IN THE LEGISLATURE, THE THREE BILLS THAT HAVE BEEN INTRODUCED REGARDING CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS' SALARIES, THEY HAVE NOT BEEN MOVED TO BE DIVIDED. BUT I THINK THE BIGGER QUESTION THAT...THE BIGGER QUESTION THAT I THINK SENATOR CHAMBERS IS STILL NOT MAKING REFERENCE TO IS STATE LAW AND STATE STATUTE GOVERNS WHAT THESE OFFICERS ARE PAID. IF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE CHOOSES NOT TO APPROPRIATE \$100,000 TO ONE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS' SALARY AND, INSTEAD, APPROPRIATES \$99,000, THERE WILL BE A DEFICIT BILL NEXT YEAR. IF WE APPROPRIATE \$101,000 TO THAT SAME OFFICER, ESSENTIALLY THERE WILL BE \$1,000 THE LEGISLATURE CAN PULL BACK THE NEXT YEAR. STATE LAW AND STATE STATUTE GOVERNS WHAT THESE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS ARE TO BE APPROPRIATED. AND SO EVEN IF THE LEGISLATURE SO CHOSE TO DIVIDE THE QUESTION ON A BILL LIKE THIS AND TRY TO RUN AMENDMENTS TO THE BILL THAT STRIKES OR ADDS MORE MONEY TO THEIR SALARIES, WE'RE STILL GOVERNED BY STATE STATUTE. AND ULTIMATELY, THERE WILL NEED TO BE A BILL THAT WOULD NEED TO BE INTRODUCED AND PASSED TO CHANGE THAT. SO I GUESS I STILL DON'T UNDERSTAND REALLY AT THE...I STILL AM NOT FULLY UNDERSTANDING WHY WE WOULDN'T JUST INCORPORATE A CONSTITUTIONAL SALARY BILL AS PART OF A BILL THAT'S NONDIVISIBLE. BECAUSE EVEN IF SENATORS WANTED TO RUN AN AMENDMENT TO THIS BILL AND TO STRIKE AN AMOUNT OR ADD AN AMOUNT, STATE STATUTE GOVERNS THAT. WE WOULD HAVE TO HAVE A SEPARATE PIECE OF LEGISLATION THAT WOULD CHANGE A SEPARATE PART OF STATUTE TO BE ABLE TO ALLOW THAT TO HAPPEN BOTH ON THE POSITIVE AND/OR THE NEGATIVE. SO TO SOME EXTENT, WE WOULD BE DEBATING OURSELVES FOR SOMETHING THAT WE WOULD HAVE TO HAVE GO THROUGH A WHOLE NOTHER LEGISLATIVE

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

PROCESS TO CHANGE, WHICH IS EXACTLY WHY WE HAVE OTHER BILLS INTRODUCED TO INCREASE SALARIES AND THOSE BILLS GO TO THEIR RESPECTIVE JURISDICTION OF THE COMMITTEE, PRIMARILY THROUGH THE GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE AND THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE. THAT PROCESS DOESN'T CHANGE. AND TO SOME EXTENT, IF SOMEONE WANTS TO DIVIDE A QUESTION ON A BILL THAT IS TRADITIONALLY CALLED, LET'S JUST SAY, A CHRISTMAS TREE OR AN OMNIBUS BILL THAT COMES FROM THAT COMMITTEE AND IT HAS A JUDGES' SALARY COMPONENT OR A CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS' SALARY COMPONENT, THAT DOESN'T MEAN THAT BILL STILL CAN'T BE DIVIDED. WE'RE SIMPLY TALKING ABOUT THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS SALARY BILL AS IT RELATES TO THE APPROPRIATIONS BILL, THE APPROPRIATIONS BILL THAT COMES OUT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE AND IS PART OF THE MAINLINE BUDGET PROCESS EVERY TWO YEARS. I CAN APPRECIATE WHERE SENATOR CHAMBERS IS COMING AT ON THIS. IT STILL, I WOULD ARGUE, HAS A REAL EFFECT THAT IF IT IS DIVIDED, WE HAVE DO HAVE TO GO THROUGH 23 SEPARATE SECTIONS, 16 SPECIFIC SECTIONS THAT DEAL WITH SPECIFIC APPROPRIATIONS, WHICH SENATOR BOLZ IS RIGHT. THAT ESSENTIALLY JUST TAKES UP TIME AND THAT ESSENTIALLY WILL JUST I THINK DRAW OUT A PROCESS THAT WE KNOW IS INEVITABLE AT THE END OF THE DAY UNLESS THERE'S A BILL INTRODUCED AND PASSED BY ANOTHER COMMITTEE PRIOR TO THE BUDGET THAT CHANGES THAT SALARY. WITH THAT, ONCE AGAIN, THIS IS NOT ONE OF THOSE RULES AMENDMENT, COLLEAGUES, THAT SENATOR CHAMBERS HAS BROUGHT THAT WILL MAKE OR BREAK A LEGISLATIVE SESSION, WILL MAKE OR BREAK THE BUDGET PROCESS, WHICH THE UNDERLYING INTENT THAT SENATOR MURANTE BROUGHT AND I SUPPORT IS TO CODIFY WHAT WE EXPERIENCED LAST YEAR WHEN THERE WAS AN AMENDMENT...OR A RULES...AN AMENDMENT MADE ON THE FLOOR TO DIVIDE THE QUESTION WHICH WOULD HAVE MADE THE LEGISLATURE HAVE TO GO LINE ITEM BY LINE ITEM BY LINE ITEM ON THE MAINLINE BUDGET BILLS. THAT'S ULTIMATELY WHAT THE RULES AMENDMENT WE'RE TRYING TO PASS STOPS FROM HAPPENING. AND SENATOR CHAMBERS' AMENDMENT, YES, WOULD STRIKE OUT ONE BILL OUT OF THE STRING OF BILLS THAT ARE MADE UP OF THE MAINLINE BUDGET. I JUST DON'T SEE IT AS SOMETHING THAT REALLY, AT THE END OF THE DAY, WE NEED TO MOVE FORWARD ON SENATOR CHAMBERS' AMENDMENT. BECAUSE IF ANYONE REALLY WANTS TO STILL RUN AN AMENDMENT ON 16 SEPARATE SECTIONS TO DRAW OUT TIME, TO MAKE AN ARGUMENT, TO MAKE THEIR POINT, THEY'RE STILL ABLE TO DO SO. SO WITH THAT, I'D ONCE AGAIN RESPECTFULLY URGE THE BODY TO VOTE AGAINST SENATOR CHAMBERS' AMENDMENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE.

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

SENATOR MELLO: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE. I'D LIKE TO ASK SENATOR MELLO A QUESTION.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR MELLO, WILL YOU YIELD TO A QUESTION?

SENATOR MELLO: OF COURSE.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SENATOR MELLO, IN THE TIME THAT YOU'VE SERVED WITH ME, DO YOU THINK I HAVE A RELATIVELY GOOD MEMORY?

SENATOR MELLO: YES.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: DO YOU THINK YOU'VE SEEN ANY SITUATIONS WHERE I WOULD BEHAVE IN A CERTAIN WAY AND I WILL ANNOUNCE AT THE OUTSET THAT I'M DOING "A" BECAUSE THE LEGISLATURE DID "B" AND I WANT TO DEMONSTRATE SOMETHING BY WHAT I'M DOING?

SENATOR MELLO: YOU HAVE DONE THAT IN MY TIME HERE, YES.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. THAT'S ALL I WANT TO ASK YOU. MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, IF YOU...THEY SAY EXPERIENCE IS THE BEST TEACHER AND SOME WILL HAVE NO OTHER. YOU OUGHT TO LET SLEEPING DOGS LIE. NOBODY HAS ATTEMPTED TO DIVIDE THIS SALARY BILL. LEAVE IT ALONE. BUT I'LL TELL YOU WHAT I'M GOING TO DO. TAKE IT AS A THREAT. TAKE IT AS A THREAT. I PROMISE YOU THAT WHEN THE BILL FOR CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS COMES BEFORE US, IF YOU PASS THIS AMENDMENT, THEN I'M GOING TO DO WHAT I'VE NEVER DONE BEFORE, NEVER HAD ANY INCLINATION TO DO, BUT TO SHOW YOU THAT SOMETIMES THE RULES THAT YOU INSIST ON PUTTING IN JUST FOR THE SAKE OF CONSISTENCY EVEN THOUGH THERE'S NOTHING THAT EVER HAPPENED TO JUSTIFY IT, THEN I'M GOING TO DO SOMETHING SO THAT SENATOR MELLO CAN SAY, SEE WHAT I TOLD YOU? I'M GOING MAKE A NOTE TO MYSELF BECAUSE SOME IMPORTANT ISSUES ARE GOING TO ARISE BETWEEN NOW AND THE TIME WE GET TO THE BUDGET BILL. BUT I'M MAKING A PROMISE. I PROMISE, ON THE HEAD OF SENATOR MELLO, THAT WHEN THAT SALARY BILL COMES UP, I'M GOING TO OFFER A MOTION ON EVERY ONE OF THE SECTIONS THAT COMPRISE THAT BILL. AND I MAY TAKE A VOTE ON IT AND LOSE. THEN I'LL MAKE A MOTION TO RECONSIDER. AND I'M GOING TO SHOW YOU THAT IN YOUR WISDOM AND YOUR INTELLIGENCE AND YOUR PUTTING ME IN MY

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

PLACE, THAT YOU'RE GIVING ME TOOLS TO WORK WITH THAT I DON'T INTEND TO USE IF YOU LEAVE ME ALONE. NOW, I AGREED AT THE OUTSET TO THE MAJOR BILLS COMPRISING WHAT IS CALLED THE BUDGET PACKAGE. THIS IS NOT ONE OF THOSE. BUT IF YOU INSIST ON SAYING I'VE GOT THE TRAIN ROLLING. I'M GOING TO ADD SOME MORE CARS TO IT, DO IT. ACT IN HASTE, REPENT AT LEISURE. AND FOR THOSE NEW PEOPLE, AS OLD AS I AM, I ASSURE YOU I WILL NOT GET TIRED AS THE SESSION GOES ON. YOU'LL GET TIRED BEFORE I WILL. I DON'T EAT THE LOBBYISTS' FOOD. I DON'T DRINK WHATEVER THEY GIVE YOU TO DRINK. AND WHEN YOU'RE IN THERE BECAUSE YOU'RE TIRED, I'LL BE OUT HERE IN A VIRTUALLY EMPTY CHAMBER CARRYING ON, DOING WHAT I DO WELL. AND I DON'T NEED YOU HERE BECAUSE WE'RE CARRIED ALL OVER THE WORLD, I FOUND OUT, BECAUSE PEOPLE CONTACT MY OFFICE ABOUT THINGS THAT I SAID ON THE FLOOR OF THE LEGISLATURE. SOME PEOPLE FROM AUSTRALIA DID THAT. SO I DON'T KNOW HOW IT GOES EVERYWHERE BUT IT DOES. SO I DON'T NEED YOU FEW. IF YOU WERE THE ONLY AUDIENCE I HAD, I WOULDN'T EVEN WASTE MY TIME UNLESS THE "PROFESSOR" WERE HERE. THAT'S SENATOR SCHUMACHER, THE MASTER OF QUANTUM PHYSICS. HE'S TEACHING ME, AND I'M A GOOD STUDENT BUT I'M NOT ANYWHERE NEAR WHERE HE IS. BUT I WANT TO TELL YOU SOMETHING ELSE. I LISTEN TO EVERYBODY. I LEARN FROM EVERYBODY. AND I'M...

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE, SENATOR.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...NOT AS DUMB AS SOME OF YOU ALL ARE WHO CLOSE YOUR MIND TO WHAT I SAY BECAUSE YOU DON'T LIKE ME. I COULD LEARN FROM ADOLF HITLER. HE SAID RULERS ARE FORTUNATE THAT THE PEOPLE DO NOT THINK, ADOLF HITLER, AND HE'S RIGHT. A BAD PERSON IS NOT WRONG ALL THE TIME. MOST PEOPLE ARE RIGHT MOST OF THE TIME, EVEN LIARS. IF THEY LIED ALL THE TIME, YOU WOULDN'T BELIEVE ANYTHING THEY SAID. SO A CLEVER LIAR TELLS THE TRUTH 99 PERCENT OF THE TIME. SO THE BIG LIE IS TOLD AND YOU SWALLOW THAT TOO. BUT ANYWAY, I'LL WRAP MINE UP ON MY CLOSING. BUT THAT PROMISE I MADE, I INTEND TO KEEP. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR BLOOMFIELD, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. GOOD MORNING, COLLEAGUES. SENATOR CHAMBERS HAS KIND OF PERSUADED ME TO SUPPORT HIS AMENDMENT. UNFORTUNATELY, HE WENT A STEP FURTHER AND THREW THE THREAT OUT THERE AS HE SOMETIMES DOES. I'M STILL GOING TO SUPPORT HIS AMENDMENT. BUT WE CANNOT BE THREATENED OR INTIMIDATED INTO CHANGING YOUR VOTE. SO LET'S NOT LET ANY THOUGHT OR INTIMIDATION FROM ANYONE, INCLUDING SENATOR CHAMBERS, WHO I

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

HAVE A GREAT DEAL OF RESPECT FOR, CHANGE THE WAY YOU VOTE. LET THE FACTS AS PRESENTED CAUSE YOU TO VOTE THE WAY YOU WILL. AND I WOULD YIELD THE REST OF MY TIME TO SENATOR CHAMBERS.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE YIELDED 4:03.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, "JOHNNY." MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, LET ME TELL YOU ALL SOMETHING. IF YOU FOLLOW WHAT SENATOR BLOOMFIELD SAID, I'LL WIN ALL THE TIME. HE SAID, SEE WHERE THE FACTS GO AND THAT'S HOW YOU VOTE. YOU'D VOTE WITH ME ON EVERYTHING BECAUSE I COME WITH FACTS, BUT THEY'RE NOT FACTS THAT YOU LIKE. BUT I DO UTTER WORDS THAT SOME PEOPLE TAKE AS A THREAT. BUT I DIDN'T WANT ANYBODY TO HAVE TO CHARACTERIZE THIS, SO I DID IT MYSELF. AND HOWEVER YOU CHARACTERIZE IT, THEN LET ME MAKE IT BETTER FOR YOU. IT'S A SOLEMN PROMISE AND I WILL CARRY IT OUT. AND, IN FACT, I WILL GIVE YOU ALL A SAMPLE OF IT. ONCE...LET ME ASK "GENERAL" GARRETT A QUESTION, AS CHAIRPERSON OF THE RULES COMMITTEE.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR GARRETT, WILL YOU YIELD TO A QUESTION?

SENATOR GARRETT: YES, I WILL.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SENATOR GARRETT, THE MOTION BEFORE US TODAY IS TO ADOPT PERMANENT RULES. IS THAT CORRECT?

SENATOR GARRETT: YES, IT IS.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SO THAT MEANS EVERY RULE IN THIS BOOK IS BEFORE US FOR CONSIDERATION, ISN'T IT?

SENATOR GARRETT: YES, IT IS.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SO I CAN OFFER AN AMENDMENT TO EVERY RULE THAT'S IN THIS RULE BOOK, CAN'T I?

SENATOR GARRETT: YES, YOU CAN.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, YOU WANT ME TO DO IT? YOU THINK I WON'T DO IT? AM I GOING TO HAVE TO TAKE THIS FIRST DAY TO SHOW YOU THAT WHEN I SAY SOMETHING I MEAN IT? AND THEN YOU CAN SWAT ME DOWN ANYTIME YOU WANT TO. BUT I WILL GET BACK UP AND I WILL WIN BECAUSE YOU'VE GOT 90 LEGISLATIVE DAYS. I DON'T HAVE ANY SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP PULLING ME. I'M NOT A PART OF THE

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

GOVERNOR'S CLIQUE. HE CANNOT TELL ME WHAT TIME IT IS. SO GIVE ME WHAT I NEED, AND YOU'VE JUST ABOUT DONE IT. AND YOU KNOW HOW I CAN DRAFT ENOUGH AMENDMENTS TO TAKE ALL THE TIME I WANT? ALL I HAVE TO DO IS LOOK AT A RULE AND SAY, STRIKE SECTION C OF THIS RULE, WHATEVER IT IS. YOU NEED TO KNOW WHO YOU'RE PLAYING WITH. I NEED TO KNOW WHAT THE RULES ARE ACCORDING TO WHICH THE GAME IS BEING PLAYED. AND IT'S MY JOB TO BEAT YOU AT YOUR OWN GAME, UNDER YOUR RULES. SO IF I DECIDE THAT I'M GOING TO USE THE RULE BOOK TO KEEP US HERE THE REST OF THE SESSION, I WILL BE DOING IT ACCORDING TO YOUR RULES, NOT MINE. IF I'M HERE WHEN WE TAKE A VOTE ON PERMANENT RULES, I GENERALLY VOTE NO. BUT I'M THE ONE WHO DOES NOT MAKE MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES, THE RULES THAT OTHERS ADOPTED. BUT THEN WHEN THOSE RULES PINCH...

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE, SENATOR.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...AND THEY CANNOT DO WHAT THEY WANT TO DO UNDER THE RULES THEY ADOPTED, THEY STAND UP AND EVERY TIME THEY MAKE A MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES, THEY SAY, I MADE A MISTAKE WHEN I VOTED FOR THIS RULE BECAUSE WE CANNOT, IN FACT, CARRY OUT OUR BUSINESS WITH THIS RULE IN PLACE. BUT I'M NOT SMALL-MINDED. IF I THINK IT'S NECESSARY TO SUSPEND THE RULE TO FACILITATE WHAT THE LEGISLATURE NEEDS TO DO, I'LL VOTE TO SUSPEND THE RULES WITHOUT EVEN DISCUSSING IT. BUT WHEN YOU SLAP ME, I THINK YOU CHRISTIANS MEAN WHAT YOU SAY, YOU TREAT OTHERS AS YOU WANT TO BE TREATED. SO I KNOW HOW YOU WANT TO BE TREATED. AND YOU WANT ME TO KEEP MY WORD. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR MELLO, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. AND THIS IS YOUR THIRD TIME.

SENATOR MELLO: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE. WOULD SENATOR CHAMBERS YIELD TO A QUESTION?

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR CHAMBERS, WOULD YOU YIELD TO A QUESTION?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: IF MY NAME WERE McCOY, I WOULD SAY NO. BUT MY NAME IS ERNIE CHAMBERS, BUT I'M THE REAL McCOY. SO, YES, I WILL.

SENATOR MELLO: SENATOR CHAMBERS, IN OUR TIME SERVING TOGETHER, HAVE WE WORKED ON ISSUES THAT SOMETIMES WE MAY NOT HAVE ALWAYS INITIALLY AGREED UPON?

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

SENATOR CHAMBERS: OH, SURE.

SENATOR MELLO: DO WE TRY TO SOME EXTENT THROUGH THAT CONVERSATION, DIALOGUE, TRY TO FIND COMPROMISE AND NEGOTIATE TO GET TO YES?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: YES, AND SOMETIMES THROUGH YOUR CHARM, CHARISMA, AND INTELLIGENCE, YOU'LL SWAY ME TO YOUR SIDE OF THE QUESTION.

SENATOR MELLO: WELL, THAT'S AWFUL NICE OF YOU, SENATOR CHAMBERS. AND OUT OF RESPECT OF KNOWING THE FACTS AS YOU PRESENTED THEM IN OUR DEBATE TODAY ON THIS SPECIFIC RULE, WE HAVEN'T HAD A LOT OF DEBATE, COLLEAGUES, ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS SALARY BILL IN THE SIX YEARS I'VE BEEN HERE. AND PREFERABLY, I'D HOPE THAT WE WOULDN'T HAVE A LOT OF DEBATE AT THE END OF THE SESSION WHEN WE HAVE SO MANY OTHER IMPORTANT PIECES OF LEGISLATION TO TRY TO GET PASSED, NOT JUST AS PART OF THE BUDGET BUT, OBVIOUSLY, OTHER ISSUES THAT FALL PAST THE BUDGET. AS I MENTIONED EARLIER, COLLEAGUES, THIS AMENDMENT IS NOT SOMETHING THAT I'M WILLING TO DIE ON THE HILL FOR BECAUSE THE UNDERLYING AMENDMENT THAT I WORKED ON WITH SENATOR MURANTE AND MEMBERS OF THE RULES COMMITTEE IS WHAT REALLY MATTERS. SO IN THAT RESPECT, I WILL NOT BE VOTING ON SENATOR CHAMBERS' AMENDMENT. BUT BY ALL MEANS I WOULD HOPE THAT, FOR NEW MEMBERS, YOU DO TAKE SENATOR CHAMBERS AT HIS WORD. WHEN HE DOES MAKE A PROMISE, 99.9 PERCENT OF THE TIME HE KEEPS THAT PROMISE. AND I, FOR ONE, KNOWING THAT WE WILL HAVE PROBABLY ONCE AGAIN A VERY LENGTHY BUDGET DEBATE AS WE DID TWO YEARS AGO THAT ROUGHLY LASTED 30 HOURS, I DO NOT WANT TO HAVE TO SEE US SPEND A CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT OF TIME ON SOMETHING THAT THE STATE REQUIRES US TO APPROPRIATE MONEY FOR AND STATE LAW REQUIRES US TO HAVE TO APPROPRIATE A CERTAIN DOLLAR AMOUNT FOR. SO WITH THAT, WHILE I WILL NOT BE VOTING ON THIS AMENDMENT, I ENCOURAGE THE BODY TO ADOPT THE CHAMBERS AMENDMENT. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR SCHUMACHER, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE BODY. FOR ONE YEAR WHEN SENATOR CHAMBERS WAS BACK, I SAT WHERE SENATOR GARRETT SITS. AND I WATCHED THIS MAN INTENTLY BECAUSE HE IS THE TRUE PROFESSOR. HE'S GOT 40 YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN THIS BODY. AND WHILE HE TALKS, IF YOU LISTEN CAREFULLY, HE'S TEACHING LESSONS THAT HAVE BEEN LEARNED OVER THOSE 40 YEARS. AND THE LITTLE ISSUE

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

WE HAVE HERE WHETHER OR NOT TO INCLUDE THIS CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS IN A MOTION TO DIVIDE, THAT'S NOT WHAT'S BEING TAUGHT TODAY. IF YOU LISTEN TO HIM CAREFULLY--AND I'VE GOTTEN EVEN CLOSER BECAUSE NOW I'M JUST A SEATMATE TO SENATOR CHAMBERS--HE'S TAUGHT US TWO LESSONS ALREADY TODAY. THE FIRST LESSON WELL TO BE HEEDED: DON'T MAKE RULES YOU DON'T NEED BECAUSE PEOPLE WHO ARE GOOD AT RULES CAN USE THEM AGAINST YOU. THE SECOND LESSON, IT MAY HAVE APPEARED ON FIRST LEVEL TO BE A THREAT. IT WAS NO THREAT. IN THAT WAS ANOTHER LESSON AND THAT LESSON IS TO HOW YOU USE THE RULES, HOW YOU USE AMENDMENTS TO PIECES...A PIECE OF LEGISLATION, HOW YOU USE MOTIONS TO RECONSIDER, HOW YOU FORCE THE BODY TO FOCUS ON AN ISSUE THAT OTHERWISE WOULD BLOW PAST YOU. AND THE AMENDMENT THAT HE'S OFFERED WILL NOT CHANGE WHETHER THE SUN RISES OR SETS. BUT WE CAN SHOW SENATOR CHAMBERS THAT WE UNDERSTOOD THE LESSONS AND THAT WE NOW KNOW HOW TO USE THEM TOO. AND SO I'M GOING TO SUPPORT SENATOR CHAMBERS' AMENDMENT. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU. SENATOR GROENE, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR GROENE: THANK YOU, SPEAKER. I SUPPORT SENATOR CHAMBERS' AMENDMENT. HE MAKES SENSE. IT'S AS SIMPLE AS THAT. BUT IF SENATOR CHAMBERS WOULD YIELD TO A QUESTION.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: YES.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR CHAMBERS, WILL YOU YIELD TO A QUESTION?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: YES, I WILL.

SENATOR GROENE: AS TO THE OTHER PARTS OF THIS AMENDMENT THAT'S BEEN ADDED TO THE RULES--DIVISION OF THE MAINLINE BUDGET BILL, THE DEFICIT BILL, THE CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION BILL, AND THE FUNDS TRANSFER BILL--IN YOUR 40 YEARS, HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU SEEN ANYBODY TRY TO DIVIDE THAT?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I CAN ONLY REMEMBER ONE TIME, BUT THAT DOESN'T MEAN IT HAS NEVER HAPPENED. BUT THE ONE TIME THAT IT DID, IT CAUGHT THE ATTENTION OF SENATOR MURANTE. SO MAYBE HE HAS PAID MORE ATTENTION TO THAT THAN I HAVE. BUT HERE'S WHAT THEY'RE LOOKING AT. UNDER THE RULES, HAD THE CHAIR NOT STATED THAT THAT MOTION WOULD BE OUT OF ORDER, YOU COULD HAVE TAKEN THIS BUDGET BILL, WHICH MIGHT BE AN INCH THICK IN TERMS OF THE NUMBER OF PAGES, AND

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

WITHOUT STATING A REASON FOR IT, DIVIDE THAT BUDGET BILL INTO EACH ONE OF THE SECTIONS AND HAVE TO DISCUSS AND DISPOSE OF EACH ONE INDIVIDUALLY. AND BEING PRACTICAL AND REALISTIC, WHICH THOSE WHO ARE OFFERING THESE RULES CHANGES ARE TRYING TO DO, THE LEGISLATURE LITERALLY COULD BE TIED UP FOR A NUMBER OF HOURS THAT I CANNOT EVEN CALCULATE. SO THAT'S WHY WHEN I FIRST STARTED I AGREED WITH THOSE BILLS BEING NOT SUBJECT TO A MOTION TO DIVIDE THE QUESTION, BECAUSE ADOPTING THAT MOTION WOULD NOT PREVENT YOU FROM OFFERING AMENDMENTS TO ANY PORTION OF ANY ONE OF THOSE BILLS THAT YOU DISAGREED WITH. AND SINCE THAT WAS THE BASIS FOR IT, THESE OTHER BILLS ARE SO EXTENSIVE, IT WOULD BE SO TIME-CONSUMING, I DID NOT WANT TO INCLUDE THIS PARTICULAR BILL THAT I'M TRYING TO REMOVE BECAUSE IT DOESN'T MEET THE CRITERIA THAT WERE ESTABLISHED FOR CHANGING THE RULE IN THE FIRST PLACE.

SENATOR GROENE: WOULD YOU YIELD? ANOTHER QUESTION THEN: DIDN'T YOU JUST SAY THERE WAS ANOTHER ALTERNATIVE, THAT THE SPEAKER CAN RULE THE QUESTION OUT OF ORDER? AND...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: BUT HERE'S WHAT HAPPENS...

SENATOR GROENE: ...IS THAT NOT WHAT HAPPENED LAST TIME?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...WHAT WILL HAPPEN: A SENATOR MAKES A MOTION, WHATEVER IT IS. SOMEBODY OBJECTS AND SAYS THEY BELIEVE THAT IT'S OUT OF ORDER. THEN AT SOME POINT, THE SPEAKER WILL MAKE A RULING...THE CHAIR WILL MAKE A RULING. THEN IF SOMEBODY OBJECTS, THE QUESTION IS, SHALL THE CHAIR BE OVERRULED? SO YOU HAVE A NUMBER OF VOTES. AND SO BY VOTING, YOU CAN ACTUALLY SUSTAIN A RULING BY THE CHAIR WHICH IS COMPLETELY NONSENSICAL. IF THE RULE IS EXPLICITLY STATED, SOMEBODY CAN STILL CHALLENGE A RULING MADE PURSUANT TO THAT RULE, BUT THE REST OF THE SENATORS CAN HAVE THEIR ATTENTION CALLED TO WHAT THE RULE IS AND IT'S NOT LIKELY THAT THE CHAIR WOULD BE OVERRULED IN AN INSTANCE LIKE THAT. AND MAYBE I'VE JUST BEEN CONFUSING.

SENATOR GROENE: THANK YOU, SIR. BUT I GUESS MY POINT IS IF THIS ONLY HAPPENED ONCE AND ON ONE OF THESE ISSUES AND NOT THE CONSTRUCTION BILL OR THE FUNDS TRANSFER BILL, WHY DO WE CHANGE THE HISTORY OF THIS CHAMBER BECAUSE IT HAPPENED ONCE? AND MAYBE THE INDIVIDUAL WHO DID THAT LEARNED HIS LESSON BECAUSE OF WHAT'S GOING ON RIGHT NOW. SO DO WE JUST...I WOULD NEVER SUPPORT ANYTHING TO TRY TO SILENCE SENATOR CHAMBERS. AND I WON'T SUPPORT

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

ANYTHING, I GUESS, THAT TRIES TO SILENCE ANOTHER SENATOR BECAUSE OF WHAT HE HAD DONE. I DON'T SEE THE PURPOSE OF ANY OF THIS. THANK YOU.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR KRIST, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. GOOD MORNING, COLLEAGUES, AND GOOD MORNING, NEBRASKA. I HAD A DIFFERENT PURPOSE FOR COMING UP HERE. BUT I'D LIKE TO ADDRESS THE EXTREMELY INFORMATIVE AND GREAT EXCHANGE BETWEEN SENATOR GROENE AND SENATOR CHAMBERS. AND, SENATOR GROENE, I WOULD OFFER THIS: AS WE EVOLVE AS A GROUP, THAT THIS LEGISLATURE, IN ITS FORMATION IN THE '30s UNTIL WE HAVE ARRIVED HERE TODAY, THERE HAVE BEEN NECESSITY FOR SOME RULE CHANGES. AND I WOULD SUGGEST THAT THIS IS ONE. THIS IS ONE BECAUSE IT POTENTIALLY MEANS THAT IN THE 90-DAY SESSION IN WHICH WE SIT, IN WHICH WE HAVE TO PASS A BUDGET, IF THERE WOULD BE A THREAT, IF YOU WILL, OR AN INCLINATION THAT THIS KIND OF DIVISION WOULD HAPPEN, I HAVEN'T DONE THE MATH PRECISELY, BUT I WOULD SAY THAT THE SPEAKER'S SCHEDULE SHOULD PROBABLY START THE BUDGET PROCESS IN THE TWENTIETH OR THIRTIETH DAY, WHICH MEANS THAT EACH ONE OF OUR PRIORITY BILLS WOULD FALL BY THE WAYSIDE, BECAUSE CONSTITUTIONALLY OUR REQUIREMENT IS TO PASS A BUDGET, A BALANCED BUDGET. THAT IS FOREMOST, NUMBER ONE. SO IT IS THE ANTITHESIS OF THE PROCESS OF DIVISION THAT WE ARE PUTTING INTO PLACE TODAY. AND THAT IS THAT WE ARE NOT GIVING UP OUR INDIVIDUAL LINE-ITEM VETO, IF YOU WILL, OR DISCUSSION ABOUT AN ITEM THAT WE WANT TO PULL OUT OF THAT BUDGET. BUT WE SHOULD NOT HAVE TO SEPARATE THE OTHER 1,345 LINE ITEMS, IF THAT WOULD BE THE CASE, AND DISCUSS THEM INDIVIDUALLY. AND I CAN TELL YOU FROM PRESIDING THAT ONCE THAT DIVISION HAPPENS, YOU HAVE TO TAKE IT TO ITS LOGICAL END. AND DEPENDING UPON WHAT MEMBERS HAVE A PROVERBIAL AX TO GRIND, OR THEY WANT TO TIE UP THE SESSION FOR A PERIOD OF TIME, IT CAN MAKE IT VERY DIFFICULT. I THOUGHT I WOULD ENTER THAT INTO THE CONVERSATION JUST FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION. I'M NOT TRYING TO PERSUADE YOU ONE WAY OR ANOTHER, ALTHOUGH I THINK IT'S PART OF THE FACTS THAT WE TAKE FORWARD WITH US. I APPLAUD SENATOR MURANTE'S MOTION. IF IT HAPPENED ONCE, IT CAN HAPPEN AGAIN. WE LIVE IN AN ENVIRONMENT WHERE, AS TERM LIMITS HAVE FACED US, NEW IDEAS, NEW PEOPLE, NEW PERSONALITIES COME IN TO THE BODY. THIS MAY NEVER HAVE BEEN REQUIRED WHEN PEOPLE LIKE SENATOR CHAMBERS WERE HERE FOR 10, 20, 30 YEARS, WHEN SENATOR WARNER RULED THE ROOST, SO TO SPEAK. BUT WE ARE A NEW GROUP. WE'RE A DYNAMIC GROUP. WE'RE AN ECLECTIC GROUP. AND IT COULD HAPPEN AGAIN. SO I WILL SUPPORT BOTH SENATOR MURANTE'S ORIGINAL MOTION THAT WE

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

PUT OUT OF THE RULES COMMITTEE AND I WILL ALSO SUPPORT SENATOR CHAMBERS FOR TWO REASONS. WHEN WE WERE IN THE RULES COMMITTEE, WE HAD A MOTION FROM SENATOR MURANTE. AND THEN WE HAD THE APPROPRIATIONS CHAIR COME UP TO SPEAK AND HE GAVE US THE AREAS THAT PROBABLY, PROBABLY NEEDED TO BE INCLUDED. WE DRAFTED THAT WITH THE CLERK'S HELP AND THAT'S WHAT YOU SEE BEFORE YOU. THE AMENDMENT THAT SENATOR CHAMBERS BRINGS UP JUST REMOVES ONE OF THOSE SECTIONS. SO THERE WAS NO MAGIC EXCEPT THAT IT WAS A LINE-ITEM APPROPRIATIONS BILL THAT WE WERE ADDRESSING. SO, AGAIN, FOR YOUR THOUGHT AND FOR YOUR DECISION PROCESS, COLLEAGUES, I WOULD SAY SENATOR CHAMBERS' MOTION IS APPROPRIATE. AND I WOULD ASK YOU...

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE, SENATOR.

SENATOR KRIST: ...TO SUPPORT...PARDON ME?

SPEAKER HADLEY: ...MINUTE, SENATOR.

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU. I WOULD ASK YOU TO SUPPORT BOTH THE AMENDMENT AND THE CHANGE TO THE RULES AS IT CAME OUT OF OUR COMMITTEE. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SEEING NO OTHER LIGHTS ON, SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE ON YOUR AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE. WHEN I UTTERED MY THREAT, I KNOW HOW TO PUSH SOME PEOPLE'S BUTTON IN HERE. I KNOW HOW TO MAKE CERTAIN PEOPLE RISE TO THE BAIT, TO "THE BAIT," T-H-E B-A-I-T, NOT "DEBATE." I'D LIKE TO ASK SENATOR BLOOMFIELD A QUESTION.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR BLOOMFIELD, WILL YOU YIELD TO A QUESTION?

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: YES, I WILL.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SENATOR BLOOMFIELD, DO YOU THINK I WAS SURPRISED BY ANYTHING YOU SAID, ESPECIALLY WITH REFERENCE TO THE THREAT?

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: I WOULD CERTAINLY HOPE NOT. WE'VE HAD THAT DISCUSSION BEFORE.

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

SENATOR CHAMBERS: AND DO YOU THINK I ANTICIPATED THAT YOU MIGHT DO THAT?

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: YOU MAY WELL HAVE. IT WAS PUT OUT THERE FOR US.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: AND IF I THREW THE BAIT AND YOU WENT FOR IT, IS THAT KNOWN AS RISING TO THE BAIT?

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: NO, I THINK THAT'S PUTTING OUT INFORMATION FOR THE NEW MEMBERS.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: (LAUGH) BUT WHO ROSE TO THE BAIT, SENATOR BLOOMFIELD?

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: IF YOU WANT TO CALL IT RISING TO THE BAIT, IT WAS I. AND I WILL DO IT AGAIN.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, AND I'M AWARE OF THAT. HERE'S WHAT I'M TRYING TO GET ACROSS. I HAVE NO INTEREST IN THIS RULE AS FAR AS IT HELPING ME PERSONALLY. DESPITE THE NUMEROUS TIMES, SINCE I'VE BEEN IN THIS LEGISLATURE, I'VE SAID I'M GOING TO LET YOU ALL DO WHATEVER YOU WANT TO DO; IF YOU WANT TO TEAR IT UP AND LOOK LIKE FOOLISH PEOPLE, I'LL LET YOU DO IT; IF IT DESCENDS INTO UTTER CHAOS, I'M GOING TO LET YOU DO THAT; BUT I'M STILL A MEMBER OF THIS BODY. AND WHEN WE'RE AT THE STAGE OF CONSIDERING CHANGES TO THE RULES, I'M TRYING TO SPEAK IN TERMS OF WHAT RULES ARE FOR. IT IS NOT TO TRY AND ADVANCE TO ANTICIPATE EVERY CONTINGENCY. THERE WAS A SUPREME COURT DECISION AND THE JUDGES POINTED OUT THAT WHEN IT CAME TO REVOKING A NURSE'S LICENSE, HHS, THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, HAD PUT TOGETHER A LIST OF CRITERIA. AND IT POINTED OUT ALONG THE WAY THAT THE LEGISLATURE, IN SETTING UP THIS SCHEME OF ALLOWING THE REVOCATION, COULD NOT ANTICIPATE EVERY POSSIBLE REASON THAT A LICENSE SHOULD BE REVOKED. SO THEY GIVE THAT GENERAL AUTHORITY. AND IF IT'S NOT ABUSED, THEN THE AGENCY, WITH GUIDELINES PROVIDED BY THE LEGISLATURE, CAN SET OUT RULES AND REGULATIONS. SO WE ARE NOT, THROUGH ENACTMENT OF RULES, GOING TO BE ABLE TO ANTICIPATE EVERYTHING THAT MIGHT HAPPEN. BUT IN SOME INSTANCES, AS SENATOR KRIST POINTED OUT, THE CONSEQUENCES CAN BE SO DIRE WITH REFERENCE TO CERTAIN CONTINGENCIES THAT VERY WELL MAY OCCUR. YOU DO ANTICIPATE THAT AND HEAD IT OFF. BUT WHEN IT COMES TO SOMETHING LIKE WHAT I'M TRYING TO REMOVE, IT'S INCONSEQUENTIAL, THIS CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS SALARY BILL. IT WAS

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

NOT WHAT SENATOR MURANTE HAD IN MIND. IT WAS NOT REALLY WHAT MOTIVATED THESE PROVISIONS ABOUT THE MAINLINE BUDGET BILL AND THE OTHER ASSOCIATED TAGALONG BILLS. IT WAS JUST THROWN IN FOR THE SAKE OF CONSISTENCY. SO YOU ARE NOT REALLY HURTING ANYTHING THAT CAN BE CONSIDERED STRUCTURAL. IF I BUILD A CHAMBER LIKE THIS ONE AND EVERY PART OF IT WHICH NEEDS A WEIGHT-BEARING SUPPORT HAS SUCH A SUPPORT, THAT IS A WELL-DESIGNED BUILDING. BUT IF FOR THE SAKE OF APPEARANCE, I RUN SOMETHING LIKE A TELEPHONE POLE FROM THE CENTER OF THIS ROOM UP TO THE CEILING, IT SERVES NO PURPOSE...

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE, SENATOR.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...BUT IT'S SOMETHING THAT PEOPLE MIGHT LOOK AT. THIS THING THAT YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT WITH REFERENCE TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICERS SALARY BILL IS ONE OF THE POLES THAT BEARS NO WEIGHT. THE BILL, THE AMENDMENT, THE RULE AS AMENDED CAN BE CONSIDERED TO HAVE ALL THE WEIGHT-BEARING REQUIREMENTS. I MAY NOT THINK ALL OF THAT IS NECESSARY TO BE IN THE RULES, BUT I LISTEN TO THE RATIONALE AND I IMMEDIATELY AGREE TO THOSE THINGS. BUT YOU CAN TAKE IT AS A THREAT IF YOU WANT TO. AND I'M GOING TO LET YOU KNOW SOMETHING. IN RULE 1, THERE ARE 21 SECTIONS. IN RULE 2, THERE ARE 11. AND I'LL WRITE AN AMENDMENT TO STRIKE EACH ONE OF THOSE SECTIONS AND LET'S JUST SEE HOW LONG WE'LL BE HERE BEFORE WE CAN EVEN GET TO A VOTE ON THE RULES.

SPEAKER HADLEY: TIME, SENATOR.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THE QUESTION IS, SHALL THE AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT TO THE PERMANENT RULES BE ADOPTED? ALL THOSE IN FAVOR VOTE AYE; ALL THOSE OPPOSED VOTE NAY. HAVE ALL VOTED THAT CARE TO? RECORD, MR. CLERK.

CLERK: 39 AYES, 0 NAYS, MR. PRESIDENT, ON THE ADOPTION OF THE AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSAL AS OFFERED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, MR. CLERK. WE ARE NOW BACK TO THE AMENDMENT TO THE PERMANENT RULES. IS THERE ANYONE THAT WISHES TO SPEAK? SEEING NONE, SENATOR GARRETT. SENATOR GARRETT WAIVES CLOSING. SENATORS, THE QUESTION IS, SHALL THE AMENDMENT TO THE PERMANENT RULES BE ADOPTED? ALL THOSE IN FAVOR VOTE AYE; ALL THOSE OPPOSED VOTE NAY. HAVE YOU ALL VOTED? RECORD, MR. CLERK.

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

CLERK: 35 AYES, 8 NAYS, MR. PRESIDENT, ON THE ADOPTION OF THE PROPOSED RULES CHANGE TO RULE 7, SECTION 3.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THE AMENDMENT IS ADOPTED.

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, THE NEXT AMENDMENT I HAVE TO THE...THAT COMPLETES THE RULES COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS. I NOW HAVE AN AMENDMENT AS OFFERED BY SENATOR KINTNER. MEMBERS, COPIES HAVE BEEN DISTRIBUTED ON YOUR DESK. THIS AMENDMENT TO THE PROPOSED RULES WOULD AFFECT RULE 1, SECTION 1, AND RULE 6...OR, EXCUSE ME, RULE 3, SECTION 8.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR KINTNER, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON YOUR AMENDMENT TO THE PERMANENT RULES.

SENATOR KINTNER: WELL, THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. YOU KNOW, LAST WEDNESDAY MORNING, BEFORE WE VOTED ON THE TEMPORARY RULES, I THINK WE HAVE DONE A GREAT JOB IN THE NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE BRINGING TRANSPARENCY IN SOME AREAS TOWARD DELIBERATIVE PROCESS. YET WHEN IT COMES TO SELECTION OF LEADERSHIP, YOU KNOW, WE WITHIN THE LEGISLATURE HAVE CHOSEN A PATH THAT'S NOT TRANSPARENT. YOU KNOW, IF WE ARE GOING TO HAVE PEOPLE AS THE SECOND HOUSE, THEY NEED TO KNOW WHAT WE'RE DOING. THEY NEED TO HAVE THE ABILITY TO SEE WHAT WE'RE DOING AND TO HOLD US ACCOUNTABLE. AND THAT'S WHY I THINK IT IS SO IMPORTANT THAT WE HAVE TRANSPARENCY ALL ALONG THE LINES OF WHAT WE DO. YOU KNOW, LAST YEAR THERE WAS A COUPLE BILLS, ONE BY SENATOR CRAWFORD, I BELIEVE ONE BY SENATOR MELLO THAT BROUGHT TRANSPARENCY IN THE GOVERNMENT AND I SUPPORTED THOSE BILLS. I THOUGHT IT WAS A GREAT IDEA. THIS IS ANOTHER STEP IN THE PROCESS OF MAKING WHAT WE DO HERE TRANSPARENT AND MAKING IT SO THE PEOPLE WHO WISH TO SEE WHAT WE'RE DOING CAN EASILY DO SO. THE THIRD THING THAT I'M WORKING ON, AND YESTERDAY I HAD A MEETING WITH SENATOR EBKE AND SENATOR MORFELD IN MY OFFICE AND WE TALKED ABOUT HOW TO MAKE OUR WEB PAGE MORE TRANSPARENT, HOW TO MAKE IT SO IT'S MUCH EASIER FOR YOU JUST TO PULL UP A BILL AND SEE HOW EVERYONE VOTED, HOW TO MAKE IT EASIER FOR...TO LOOK UP A SENATOR AND SEE HOW HE VOTES. SO THIS IS A PROCESS ALL ACROSS THE BOARD OF MAKING THIS ENTIRE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS OPEN SO PEOPLE CAN SEE IT, SO PEOPLE CAN ASK QUESTIONS, AND ULTIMATELY SO PEOPLE CAN HOLD US ACCOUNTABLE. THAT IS ALL THIS IS. SO IT IS NOT JUST ONE THING. THIS, WHAT I'M PROPOSING HERE, IS JUST ONE PIECE OF AT LEAST THREE DIFFERENT AREAS THAT I BELIEVE WILL MAKE

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

US MORE ACCOUNTABLE AND MORE TRANSPARENT TO THE PUBLIC. SO IF YOU WANT TO SAY THIS IS A PARTISAN MOVE, I HAVEN'T TALKED TO ANYONE IN ANY REPUBLICAN PARTY THAT ASKED ME TO DO THIS. THIS IS WHAT I THINK IS RIGHT. SO I THINK THE WEB PAGE NEEDS TO BE BETTER. AND WE'RE GOING TO TAKE THAT TO THE EXECUTIVE BOARD. I'VE ALREADY TALKED TO CHAIRMAN KRIST ABOUT THAT AND HE IS AWARE THAT THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WE'D LIKE TO SEE DONE. SO THIS IS AN ENTIRE PROCESS OF MAKING OUR LEGISLATURE OPEN TO OUR CONSTITUENTS SO THEY CAN SEE WHAT WE ARE DOING. I WOULD ADD THAT I KNOW THAT THERE HAS BEEN PEOPLE THAT ARE WORRIED ABOUT, YOU KNOW, HAVING TO ANSWER TO THEIR FELLOW SENATORS. IT MAY MAKE IT UNCOMFORTABLE. WELL, GUESS WHAT, WE WERE ELECTED TO MAKE TOUGH DECISIONS. I THINK THAT WE'LL GET THROUGH THAT. I REALLY, REALLY DO. WE HAVE GOOD PEOPLE HERE. WE HAVE PEOPLE THAT SEE THE BIG PICTURE. WE HAVE PEOPLE THAT WORK VERY HARD AND I DON'T THINK IF YOU VOTE AGAINST SOMEONE THAT THEY ARE GOING TO HOLD THAT AGAINST YOU. AS A MATTER OF FACT, I, FROM THE FLOOR ON WEDNESDAY AFTER I SPOKE, I RELEASED WHO I VOTED FOR. I PUT IT OUT THERE BECAUSE I THINK IT'S THE RIGHT THING TO DO AND I WOULDN'T ASK ANYONE TO DO ANYTHING THAT I HAVEN'T ALREADY DONE. SO I URGE MY FELLOW SENATORS TO ADOPT THIS AND LET'S MAKE THIS A MORE OPEN AND TRANSPARENT BODY. I THINK WE'RE ALL GOING TO BENEFIT--THE PEOPLE IN HERE, THE PEOPLE AT HOME, AND THE PEOPLE WHO WATCH THESE THINGS, LIKE THE MEDIA. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR KRIST, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. GOOD MORNING, COLLEAGUES, AGAIN AND GOOD MORNING, NEBRASKA. THIS IS THE ONE AND ONLY TIME I WILL TALK ABOUT THIS ISSUE. I HAVE PASSED OUT TO YOU TWO NEWS ARTICLES THAT WERE WRITTEN, ONE IN THE LINCOLN PAPER AND ONE IN THE OMAHA PAPER. AND I HAVE TO TELL YOU THAT THIS IS NOT NEW FOR ME. I HAVE BEEN AN INDEPENDENT-THINKING PERSON SINCE I'VE BEEN HERE. THE GOVERNOR APPOINTED ME AND THEN DIDN'T LIKE ME THE NEXT DAY. AND I'M NOT MAKING A JOKE OF THAT. IT WAS TRUE. WE DISAGREED ON AN ISSUE AND THAT'S THE WAY IT WAS. AND YOU KNOW WHAT, THAT'S THE TRANSPARENCY OF WORKING HERE AND DOING WHAT WE DO. EVERYTHING WE DO IS TRANSPARENT. EVERY WORD I AM MUMBLING TO YOU RIGHT NOW WILL BE RECORDED AND PART OF A PERMANENT TRANSCRIPT. LET ME TAKE IT TO THE OPPOSITE...OR TO THE ULTIMATE END. YOU THINK WHEN YOU ARE IN EXEC SESSION, YOU'RE IN EXEC SESSION? WE'RE PROBABLY ONE OF THE ONLY GROUPS IN THIS STATE WITH THE OPEN MEETING LAWS AND ALL THE OTHER THINGS THAT GO ON, WE HAVE THE PRESS IN THE ROOM WITH US. THEY ARE TAKING NOTES. EVERYTHING WE DO IS TRANSPARENT.

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

EVERYTHING WE DO EXCEPT FOR ONE VOTE AT THE BEGINNING. NOW IF YOU READ THE HISTORY ON THE THIRD HANDOUT THAT I GAVE TO YOU, THE VALUES OF GEORGE NORRIS, I'M NOT GOING TO READ THEM TO YOU. I JUST THINK YOU NEED TO LOOK AT IT AND REALIZE THAT FROM THE '30s UNTIL THE '70s THERE WAS A DIFFERENT CONCEPT IN PLACE. THERE WERE ACTUALLY ONE OR TWO OR THREE PEOPLE THAT WERE ASSIGNING ALL OF THESE POSITIONS. THAT'S THE WAY IT HAPPENS IN OTHER LEGISLATURES AND AROUND THE STATE, BY THE WAY. THE SPEAKER OR THE HOUSE LEADER ASSIGNS EVERYBODY. SOMETIME BETWEEN THE '30s AND THE '50s THERE WAS A COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES CONCEPT WHERE NOW THERE WAS A BIGGER GROUP OF PEOPLE MAKING THOSE ASSIGNMENTS. AND THEN SOMEBODY STOOD UP AND SAID, YOU KNOW WHAT, ALL 49 PEOPLE SHOULD HAVE A VOTE. BUT LET'S NOT JEOPARDIZE THE WORKING RELATIONSHIP OF THE NONPARTISAN BODY. LET'S KEEP THAT VOTE SECRET. READ YOUR CONSTITUTION. THAT IS WELL WITHIN THE LINES OF THE CONSTITUTION. IT ALLOWS US TO DO THAT. NOW IN THESE ARTICLES I KNOW I SAID OR I WAS QUOTED TO SAY THAT I HAVE A LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION, A STUDY RESOLUTION THAT I WOULD SUBMIT. AND I'LL TELL YOU WHY I'M NOT GOING TO DO THAT RIGHT TODAY, BECAUSE OF THIS ARTICLE IN THE WORLD-HERALD AND THIS ARTICLE IN THE JOURNAL. IN FACT, I BELIEVE THAT THESE FOLKS AT THE COUNTY LEVEL HAVE GIVEN US EVERY REASON IN THE WORLD TO SAY THERE IS A GOOD REASON WHY OUR FOREFATHERS, OUR PREDECESSORS WANTED THIS TO BE THE KIND OF BALLOT IT IS. I'VE ALMOST BEEN CENSURED TWO OR THREE TIMES BY THE DOUGLAS COUNTY REPUBLICAN PARTY. I VOTED YES FOR MEDICAID EXPANSION. YOU CAN'T DO THAT BECAUSE THAT'S NOT WHAT WE WANT YOU TO DO. WELL, WE HAVE TO HAVE A DISCUSSION ABOUT HEALTHCARE DELIVERY SYSTEMS IN THIS STATE. IT CAN'T KEEP COMING OUT OF THE GENERAL FUND. WE'RE GIVING TAX DOLLARS TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND WE ARE NOT TAKING ANY TAX DOLLARS BACK. NOW SINCE THAT TIME I HAVE REVERSED MY VOTE. I HAVE NOT SUPPORTED ANY MEDICAID EXPANSION IN THE LAST FEW YEARS. ALL OF A SUDDEN I'M A GOOD BOY NOW. I'M BACK IN THE CLUB. WELL, I DID IT FOR REASONS THAT WERE PRESENTED TO ME IN COMMITTEE. THIS COMMITTEE DID NOT HEAR FROM SENATOR KINTNER. IT HEARD FROM SENATOR SCHNOOR. THE QUESTIONS THAT WERE ASKED TO SENATOR SCHNOOR WERE NOT ANSWERED TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE COMMITTEE, AND THE EVIDENCE WAS NOT COMPELLING TO VOTE IT OUT OF COMMITTEE. NOW IT'S SENATOR KINTNER'S RIGHT TO BRING IT OUT ON THE FLOOR TODAY AND I APPRECIATE THAT. AND I THINK IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS FOR SENATOR KINTNER YOU SHOULD ASK THOSE QUESTIONS TODAY. BUT LET ME SHOW YOU...REFER YOU TO THE LAST LINE IN MARTHA STODDARD'S...

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE, SENATOR.

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIR...OR, MR. PRESIDENT, I'M SORRY. THE LAST SENTENCE IN THIS ARTICLE, AFTER BAUMGART TEARS ME APART FOR NOT DOING WHAT HE WANTS ME TO DO, HE SAYS I'M GOING TO BE CONSIDERED FOR CENSURE AT THEIR JANUARY MEETING. AND OH, BY THE WAY, THEY'RE ELECTING OFFICERS THAT DAY TOO. AND WHAT ARE THEY GOING TO DO? IT IS GOING TO BE A SECRET BALLOT. HE MAKES MY POINT. IF I WAS EVER FOR CHANGING THIS STRUCTURE, THANK THE DOUGLAS COUNTY REPUBLICAN PARTY CHAIR FOR CHANGING MY MIND. AND BY THE WAY, BRYAN, I DIDN'T LIE TO YOU. I TOLD YOU IN NO UNCERTAIN TERMS, YOU DO YOUR JOB, I'LL DO MINE. AND I WILL LISTEN AS A COMMITTEE MEMBER AND VOTE MY HEART. THANK YOU, COLLEAGUES.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR NORDQUIST, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR NORDQUIST: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS. I RISE IN OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT BY SENATOR KINTNER. I CERTAINLY APPRECIATE HIS PASSION ON THIS ISSUE BUT THIS IS AN ISSUE THAT THE RULES COMMITTEE HAS VETTED, RULES COMMITTEE THAT REPRESENTS THIS BODY, HAS REPRESENTATIVES OF EACH CAUCUS, HAS I THINK A VERY THOUGHTFUL RULES COMMITTEE. AND IT WAS A UNANIMOUS DECISION NOT TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THIS. AND THROUGH OUR DELIBERATIONS WE TALKED ABOUT TWO AREAS: FIRST WAS THE HISTORY, AND I THINK SENATOR KRIST DID A FINE JOB OF REVIEWING THAT, THAT WE HAD SOME PEOPLE, PROPONENTS TESTIFY THAT THIS HAS JUST BEEN AROUND SINCE THE EARLY '70s AND BEFORE THAT IT WAS TRANSPARENT. WELL, THAT IS NOT THE CASE, AS SENATOR KRIST SAID. BEFORE THAT IT WAS MUCH LESS TRANSPARENT. IT WAS PROBABLY A SMOKY BACK ROOM RIGHT OVER HERE WHERE THREE PEOPLE GOT TOGETHER AND SAID, THESE PEOPLE ARE COMMITTEE CHAIRS AND THE BODY IS GOING TO GO ALONG WITH IT. WE SEE THAT SAME PROCESS RIGHT NOW IN CAPITOL HILL WHEN THEY DO THEIR CAUCUS, SECRET CAUCUS AND THEY ELECT THE LEADERSHIP AND THEN THEY DO A FORMAL VOTE ON IT. BUT THE ACTUAL DECISION MAKING IS IN A BACK ROOM AND ISN'T IN A TRANSPARENT PROCESS. THE SECOND THING WE TALKED ABOUT WAS WHAT WE HAVE ENSHRINED, PREVIOUS LEGISLATURES HAVE ENSHRINED IN STATE LAW WHEN IT COMES TO OTHER LEGISLATIVE BODIES IN THIS STATE. SECTION 84-1413 IN OUR OPEN MEETINGS ACT FOR SCHOOL BOARDS, FOR OTHER POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS, MUNICIPALITIES, COUNTIES, IT SAYS, "THE VOTE TO ELECT LEADERSHIP WITHIN A PUBLIC BODY MAY BE TAKEN BY SECRET BALLOT, BUT THE TOTAL NUMBER OF VOTES FOR EACH CANDIDATE SHALL BE RECORDED IN THE MINUTES." AND THIS HAS BEEN AROUND ALSO SINCE THE '70s. WE HAVE...WE PUT THIS IN OUR OPEN MEETINGS ACT TO SAY WE THINK

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

THAT CIVILITY IN LEGISLATIVE BODIES IS IMPORTANT; THAT IN A LEGISLATIVE BODY, YOU'RE NOT AN EXECUTIVE. YOU ARE NOT CALLING ALL THE SHOTS. YOU HAVE TO WORK WITH EVERYONE ELSE IN THAT LEGISLATIVE BODY TO GET THINGS DONE. AND IF A SCHOOL BOARD OR A CITY OR A COUNTY WANTS TO ELECT THEIR LEADERSHIP, AND I KNOW ACCORDING TO INFORMATION WE'VE GOTTEN FROM THE LEAGUE OF MUNICIPALITIES AND NACO AND THE SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION MANY, MANY OF THEM DO THIS BY SECRET BALLOT TO BE ABLE TO PROTECT THOSE RELATIONSHIPS SO WE CAN GOVERN AND LEGISLATE IN AS CIVIL OF A WAY AS POSSIBLE. I THINK THE ALTERNATIVE IS LOOKING AT WHAT WE HAVE IN CONGRESS WHEN WE HAVE A LEGISLATIVE BODY WITH NO RELATIONSHIPS AND ESSENTIALLY NO ABILITY TO GET THINGS DONE. SO THOSE WERE THE POINTS THAT WE THOUGHT LONG AND HARD ABOUT BEFORE THE RULES COMMITTEE. I KNOW SOME PEOPLE SAY WE ARE RESPONSIBLE TO OUR CONSTITUENTS AND THERE'S NO DOUBT WE ARE. I TOOK THIS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE MONTH. I'VE HAD TWO NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION MEETINGS AND HAVE PUT TO THOSE NEIGHBORS, I ASKED THEM, I KNOW YOU CONTACT ME OFTEN ABOUT PUBLIC SAFETY AND PROPERTY TAXES AND EDUCATION. BUT WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THE NEED TO HAVE A SECRET BALLOT? WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT...BECAUSE I, IN MY TEN YEARS AS A STAFFER, AS A LEGISLATOR, I HAVE NEVER TAKEN A CALL AS A STAFFER OR AS A SENATOR AND MY STAFF HAS NEVER TAKEN A CALL TELLING ME TO VOTE FOR SOMEBODY FOR COMMITTEE CHAIR. AND I HAVE ASKED OTHER LEGISLATIVE STAFF THAT HAVE BEEN AROUND, HAVE YOU EVER HAD CALLS ENCOURAGING YOUR LEGISLATOR TO VOTE ONE WAY OR ANOTHER FOR COMMITTEE CHAIRS? AND THE RESOUNDING ANSWER IS NO. I THINK THIS IS...I THINK OUR CONSTITUENTS UNDERSTAND THIS IS ABOUT ELECTING PERSONALITIES AND PEOPLE OVER POLICY. I THINK THEY TRUST US TO COME DOWN HERE TO MEET EACH OTHER AND DECIDE WHO IT IS THAT WE WANT TO REPRESENT US IN LEADERSHIP POSITIONS. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THE CHAIR RECOGNIZES SENATOR EBKE.

SENATOR EBKE: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I RISE TODAY IN SUPPORT OF SENATOR KINTNER'S PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE RULES. AS A LIFELONG NEBRASKAN, I REMEMBER ACTUALLY GOING TO ELEMENTARY...COMING TO THIS GREAT BUILDING ON AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FIELD TRIP. AND I REMEMBER THE SEMESTER OF 8TH GRADE AMERICAN...OR, RATHER, NEBRASKA HISTORY THAT WE TOOK. AND I REMEMBER THE GREAT STORIES ABOUT GEORGE NORRIS AND I REMEMBER HOW WE WERE TOLD ABOUT HOW WE ARE THE ONLY UNICAMERAL LEGISLATURE IN THE COUNTRY AND THAT OUR UNICAMERAL WORKS BECAUSE THE PEOPLE ARE THE SECOND HOUSE. MR. PRESIDENT, UNLIKE OTHER LEGISLATURES, THERE IS NO OTHER BODY

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

ACROSS THE HALL THAT CAN PROVIDE A COUNTERWEIGHT TO OUR MISTAKES OR SIMPLY OUR IMPULSES. OUR COUNTERWEIGHTS ARE THE CITIZENS WHO SENT US HERE. AND THEY DESERVE TO KNOW HOW WE VOTE ON EVERYTHING, INCLUDING THOSE LEADERSHIP VOTES. BECAUSE EVEN THOUGH THIS IS ONLY MY SEVENTH DAY IN THIS AUGUST BODY, IT'S CLEAR TO ME THAT THOSE WE ELECT AS LEADERS HAVE A LOT TO DO WITH HOW THE LEGISLATION MOVES THROUGH THE BODY. I UNDERSTAND THE IMPULSE FOR MAINTAINING SECRET BALLOTS. IT IS A VERY HUMAN IMPULSE. MOST OF US DON'T LIKE TO HURT OTHERS' FEELINGS. AND WE OPERATE UNDER THE EXPECTATION THAT A BALLOT CAST IN SECRET AMOUNTS TO THE AVOIDANCE OF HURTING THOSE FEELINGS. BUT WE'RE ALL ADULTS HERE. AND WE OWE EACH OTHER HONESTY MORE THAN WE OWE THEM A PROMISE OF COMFORT. WE'RE ALL ELECTED TO SERVE THE PEOPLE OF OUR DISTRICTS. AND WE OWE OUR CONSTITUENTS TRANSPARENCY IN OUR ACTIONS SO THAT THEY CAN HOLD US ACCOUNTABLE OR MAYBE EVEN OCCASIONALLY THEY'LL PAT US ON THE BACK. THE SECOND HOUSE CAN'T DO ITS JOB IF WE CAST SECRET BALLOTS. I RAN ON A PROMISE OF TRANSPARENCY. I TOLD THE VOTERS IN MY DISTRICT THAT I WOULD POST EVERY VOTE ON SOCIAL MEDIA. AND I DID THAT BEFORE ANYBODY WAS RUNNING AGAINST ME. WHETHER I HAD A REPUBLICAN OR A DEMOCRAT RUNNING AGAINST ME, THAT WAS PART OF THE DEAL. I WAS GOING TO BE AS TRANSPARENT AS POSSIBLE. AND I HAVE POSTED ALL OF THOSE VOTES, INCLUDING THE LEADERSHIP VOTES THAT I MADE LAST WEEK ON SOCIAL MEDIA. I TOLD VOTERS THAT THEY MIGHT NOT ALWAYS AGREE WITH MY DECISIONS, BUT THAT I'D LISTEN TO THEM, CONSIDER THEIR POSITIONS, AND TELL THEM WHY I VOTED THE WAY THAT I DID. I HAVE ENOUGH CONFIDENCE IN THE PEOPLE OF THE 32ND LEGISLATIVE DISTRICT TO BELIEVE THAT THEY'LL JUDGE ME FAIRLY SHOULD I DECIDE TO RUN FOR REELECTION IN FOUR YEARS. I HOPE THAT MY COLLEAGUES TRUST THEIR CONSTITUENTS AS WELL AND WILL VOTE TO SUPPORT THE AMENDMENT AND VOTE FOR MORE TRANSPARENCY. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: MR. CLERK.

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, I HAVE SOME NEW BILLS. (READ LB333-362 BY TITLE FOR THE FIRST TIME.) I ALSO HAVE, MR. PRESIDENT, A NEW RESOLUTION, LR26CA, A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT BY SENATOR LARSON, PROPOSES AN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE III, SECTION 8, OF THE NEBRASKA CONSTITUTION. A COMMUNICATION FROM THE SPEAKER DIRECTING THAT LR23 BE REFERRED TO REFERENCE COMMITTEE FOR PURPOSES OF CONDUCTING A HEARING. HEARING NOTICES FROM HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AND THE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE. AN ANNOUNCEMENT: REVENUE COMMITTEE WILL MEET AT 1:30 IN ROOM 1524; REVENUE, 1:30.

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

SOME NAME ADDS, MR. PRESIDENT: SENATOR GARRETT TO LB97; SENATOR GARRETT TO LB146; PANSING BROOKS TO LB107; STINNER TO LB320; MELLO, LB255; MELLO, LB226; (ALSO MELLO TO LB202, LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGES 182-188.) [LB333 LB334 LB335 LB336 LB337 LB338 LB339 LB340 LB341 LB342 LB343 LB344 LB345 LB346 LB347 LB348 LB349 LB350 LB351 LB352 LB353 LB354 LB355 LB356 LB357 LB358 LB359 LB360 LB361 LB362 LB97 LB146 LB107 LB320 LB255 LB226 LB202 LR26CA]

MR. PRESIDENT, SENATOR SULLIVAN WOULD MOVE TO RECESS THE BODY UNTIL 1:30 P.M.

SPEAKER HADLEY: ALL THOSE IN FAVOR OF RECESSING UNTIL 1:30 P.M., PLEASE SAY AYE. THOSE OPPOSED, NAY. MOTION PASSES.

RECESS

SPEAKER HADLEY PRESIDING

SPEAKER HADLEY: GOOD AFTERNOON, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. WELCOME TO THE GEORGE W. NORRIS LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER. THE AFTERNOON SESSION IS ABOUT TO RECONVENE. SENATORS, PLEASE RECORD YOUR PRESENCE. ROLL CALL. MR. CLERK, PLEASE RECORD.

CLERK: I HAVE A QUORUM PRESENT, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, MR. CLERK. DO YOU HAVE ANY ITEMS FOR THE RECORD?

CLERK: I DO, MR. PRESIDENT. THANK YOU. NEW BILLS. (READ LB363-371 BY TITLE FOR THE FIRST TIME.) ALSO, MR. PRESIDENT, TWO APPOINTMENT LETTERS FROM THE GOVERNOR. BOTH WILL BE REFERRED TO STANDING COMMITTEE FOR A CONFIRMATION HEARING. THAT'S ALL THAT I HAVE, MR. PRESIDENT. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGES 189-191.) [LB363 LB364 LB365 LB366 LB367 LB368 LB369 LB370 LB371]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, MR. CLERK. WE WILL PROCEED TO THE FIRST ITEM ON THIS AFTERNOON'S AGENDA, MR. CLERK, WHICH IS AN AMENDMENT TO THE ADOPTION OF PERMANENT RULES, AMENDMENT RULE 1, SECTION 1. THE CHAIR WILL RECOGNIZE SENATOR GROENE.

SENATOR GROENE: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER. I STAND TO SUPPORT THE AMENDMENT TO OPEN UP THE VOTE FOR CHAIRMEN AND SPEAKER, AND TO HAVE IT RECORDED. I PERSONALLY PROMISED MY CONSTITUENTS THAT

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

THERE WOULD BE NO SECRET VOTES ON MY PART DURING THE TIME I WAS HERE AND THEY ALLOWED ME THE HONOR TO REPRESENT THEM IN THIS HISTORIC CHAMBER. MY VOTES ARE NOW RECORDED ON MY LEGISLATIVE WEB SITE. YOU CAN GO THERE. I DON'T THINK ANY OF YOU WOULD BE SURPRISED WHO I VOTE FOR. WHEN I VOTE FOR ANOTHER SENATOR, I CONSIDER IT A VOTE OF AFFIRMATION, A POSITIVE ACTION THAT I'M TAKING. I VOTE FOR SOMEONE, NOT AGAINST ANYONE. I AM NOT ASHAMED OF WHOM I VOTED FOR, THEREFORE, I FEEL NO NEED TO KEEP MY VOTES SECRET. I DID NOT COME HERE TO JOIN A FRATERNAL CLUB, AND I'VE BEEN PART OF THOSE. OUR PERSONALITIES SHOULD PLAY NO PART IN WHO WE CHOOSE TO VOTE FOR TO CHAIR A COMMITTEE, NOR SHOULD SENIORITY DEMAND A PART IN WHO WE VOTE FOR. WHAT MATTERS IS OUR PHILOSOPHY ON THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN OUR LIVES AND IN OUR CONSTITUENTS' LIVES. I VOTE TO ADVANCE THE VISION MY CONSTITUENTS HAVE ON THE AMOUNT OF INFLUENCE GOVERNMENT SHOULD HAVE IN THEIR LIVES. THAT IS A DEBATE ABOUT PHILOSOPHIES, NOT INDIVIDUAL PERSONALITIES. YES, WE ARE AN NONPARTISAN BODY. THIS IS NOT A PARTISAN ISSUE. I DON'T SEE ANY PARTISANSHIP IN THIS ISSUE. OUR UNICAMERAL IS UNIQUE, IT'S UNIQUE TO THE UNITED STATES' STATE GOVERNMENTS. IT'S PROBABLY UNIQUE TO THE WORLD IN A LOT OF WAYS. I BELIEVE IT MIRRORS CLOSELY THE ORIGINAL GREEK IDEA OF THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC FORM OF GOVERNMENT. WE ALL REPRESENT HERE AROUND 40,000 CITIZENS. THAT'S THE DEMOCRATIC PART OF IT. THE REPUBLIC PART OF IT IS THAT WE COME HERE AS INDIVIDUALS TO DEBATE AS WE REPRESENT THOSE 40,000 CITIZENS. BUT WE REPRESENT THEM. WE DON'T REPRESENT EACH OTHER. SO WHEN I VOTE, I AM TELLING THEM WHO I VOTED FOR SO THEY CAN KEEP ME ACCOUNTABLE. WE HEAR ABOUT TRANSPARENCY, BUT WE FORGET THE SECOND HALF OF THAT. IT'S CALLED ACCOUNTABILITY. WITHOUT TRANSPARENCY THERE IS NO ACCOUNTABILITY. WE HAVE THE ACCOUNTABILITY AND DISCLOSURE COMMISSION THAT WE ALL ANSWER TO. HOW WOULD THAT WORK IF WE HAD ACCOUNTABILITY WITHOUT DISCLOSURE? IT DOESN'T HAPPEN. AND THIS REFLECTS ON THAT ISSUE. SO I WOULD URGE EVERYBODY TO VOTE FOR THIS AMENDMENT. WE ARE ALL HUMANS LED BY HUMAN FRAILTIES. THE THIRST FOR POWER AND THE LUST FOR ACCLAIM IS PART OF THE HUMAN NATURE. THE TEMPTATION TO TRADE VOTES TO MAKE DEALS OR TO MAKE DEALS ON FUTURE SUPPORT ARE TOO EASILY ACHIEVED BEHIND THE VENEER OF A SECRET VOTE. SO, THEREFORE, WE NEED TO KEEP IT OPEN. WE NEED TO KEEP THIS VOTE WHERE WE ARE VOTING ON IDEOLOGIES, BELIEFS IN HOW GOVERNMENT SHOULD OPERATE. I DIDN'T VOTE FOR THE SPEAKER, AND IF IT WAS ON FRIENDSHIPS AND WHO YOU LOOK LIKE, I SHOULD HAVE VOTED FOR HIM BECAUSE HE'S GOT WHITE HAIR LIKE I DO, BUT I DIDN'T. BUT HE'S GOING TO MAKE A GREAT SPEAKER.

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE.

SENATOR GROENE: HE'S GOING TO MAKE A GREAT SPEAKER. BUT I'M NOT AFRAID TO SAY THAT, AND I'LL WORK WITH HIM ON OTHER ISSUES, AND I'M GOING TO WORK WITH HIM HERE. I HAVE NO CHOICE. (LAUGH) SO, ANYWAY, AND I'LL TELL YOU WHO ELSE I VOTED FOR IF YOU WANT TO. BUT GO TO MY WEB SITE, AND I WILL CONTINUE TO DO THAT THROUGHOUT MY CAREER HERE. HERE'S A THREAT. I MIGHT CONSIDER DOING IT AHEAD OF TIME AND SOME OF YOU MAY SAY, OH MY GOSH, IF GROENE HAS GOT ON HIS WEB SITE HE'S GOING TO VOTE FOR ME, IT WILL HURT ME MORE THAN DO ME GOOD. (LAUGH) SO, ANYWAY, BUT THAT'S...WE NEED TO HAVE AN OPEN VOTE, FOLKS. IT'S TIME FOR THIS BODY TO OPERATE TOTALLY UNDER THE COLLEGIAL BEHAVIOR OF WHAT CITIZENS EXPECT--ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY. THE TWO GO TOGETHER. THANK YOU, SPEAKER.

SPEAKER HADLEY: (VISITORS INTRODUCED.) SENATOR COOK, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR COOK: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. AND GOOD AFTERNOON, COLLEAGUES. I RISE IN OPPOSITION TO THIS PROPOSAL FOR MANY REASONS. I HESITATE TO CALL MY COLLEAGUES, OR SOME OF THEM, DISINGENUOUS IN THEIR MOTIVES. BUT I'VE BEEN ON THIS PLANET NOW FOR MORE 50 YEARS AND SOMETIMES I RECOGNIZE THAT THAT IS PRECISELY WHAT IS HAPPENING, PARTICULARLY IN A POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT THAT HAS BECOME INCREASINGLY POLITICIZED SINCE I JOINED ONLY 6 YEARS AGO. THE SECRET BALLOT IS HOW WE VOTE IN THE UNITED STATES. WHEN YOU GO INTO THE BALLOT BOX, FOR THOSE OF YOU, I'VE HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO MONITOR ELECTIONS, THAT'S WHY YOU GO IN THERE BY YOURSELF. YOU'RE NOT REALLY EVEN PERMITTED TO COMPLETE YOUR BALLOT FOR TANYA COOK OR PRESIDENT OBAMA OR WHOEVER YOU VOTE FOR OUT IN AN OPEN ENVIRONMENT. THOSE ARE INTERNATIONAL RULES RELATED TO HOW ELECTIONS ARE CONDUCTED. MOVING FROM THE SECRET BALLOT WITHIN THIS BODY, WE TALK ABOUT IDEOLOGIES. WE TALK ABOUT THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT, QUOTE UNQUOTE. THERE ARE PLENTY OF PEOPLE IN THE STATE OF NEBRASKA THAT AGREE WITH THE WAY I THINK. THEY LOOK LIKE ME. THEY HAVE THE SAME GENDER. THEIR SKIN COLOR MORE CLOSELY MATCHES MINE THAN THE MAJORITY OF THE PEOPLE IN THIS ROOM. THAT'S A FACT, FELLOW COLLEAGUES. THAT IS A FACT. SO THE IDEA THAT YOU WOULD REMOVE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR US TO ELECT THE LEADER THAT WE MOST AGREE WITH--WHETHER IT'S BECAUSE WE WANT TO BE THEIR FRIEND OR WHATEVER OUR REASON IS, IT'S OUR BUSINESS WHAT OUR REASON IS FOR VOTING FOR THAT PERSON--IS SIMPLY SOMETHING THAT I CANNOT SUPPORT. WE'VE HAD A COUPLE OF STATEMENTS THIS MORNING, YOU KNOW WHO YOU

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

ARE. WE CAN'T BE THREATENED OR INTIMIDATED INTO VOTING. THAT'S WHAT THIS MEASURE WOULD DO. I CAN'T SUPPORT ANYTHING THAT WOULD SILENCE ANOTHER SENATOR. THAT'S WHAT THIS WOULD DO IF YOU VOTED FOR IT. SO WITH THAT, MR. PRESIDENT, I YIELD THE REST OF THE TIME TO THE CHAIR. THANK YOU.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR COOK. SENATOR MURANTE, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED. SENATOR MURANTE WAIVES. SENATOR SCHNOOR.

SENATOR SCHNOOR: GOOD AFTERNOON, EVERYBODY, MR. PRESIDENT. I SAY, YOU KNOW, JUST LIKE WE DID AT THE HEARING, MY REASON FOR THIS IS SIMPLE. I THINK IT SHOULD BE AN OPEN VOTE. THAT'S IT. I, PERSONALLY, YOU KNOW, I'VE TRAVELED THE WORLD IN MY DAYS IN THE MILITARY. I'VE BEEN TO A LOT OF NASTY PLACES. SOME OF THEM PLACES IF YOU DON'T VOTE AS A DICTATOR WANTS YOU TO, AT BEST CASE YOU'LL BE SHOT; WORST CASE, YOU KNOW, YOU COULD USE YOUR IMAGINATION. SO THIS LEGISLATURE WILL CONTINUE. IT WILL CONTINUE TO DO WHAT WE DO WHETHER THIS VOTE PASSES OR NOT. SO IT'S VERY SIMPLY A MATTER OF YOU AGREE OR YOU DISAGREE, SO LET'S JUST MOVE ON AND LET'S VOTE ON IT. SO I'M IN FAVOR OF IT, OBVIOUSLY, SO I'M JUST ASKING US TO PRESS ON AND VOTE ON IT. THAT'S IT. THANK YOU.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR LARSON, I APOLOGIZE FOR SKIPPING YOU. THAT WAS NOT INTENTIONAL. SENATOR LARSON, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR LARSON: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. WE'VE HEARD A LOT ON BOTH SIDES OF THE ISSUE AND IT'S OBVIOUS THAT THERE'S PEOPLE ON BOTH SIDES THAT FEEL PASSIONATE ABOUT THIS ISSUE. AND THE ARGUMENT CAN BE MADE, HAS BEEN MADE FOR OPEN BALLOTS AND OTHERS IN THE SANCTITY OF THE SECRET BALLOTS. AND WE ALSO HAD A NICE HISTORY LESSON ON THE ORIGIN OF THE LEGISLATURE AND HOW COMMITTEE CHAIRS WERE ONCE PICKED. AND 40-SOME-ODD YEARS AGO, WE MOVED TO A SECRET BALLOT. I CONGRATULATE THAT LEGISLATURE. THEY TOOK ONE STEP TOWARDS TRANSPARENCY. WE HAVEN'T TAKEN ANOTHER STEP SINCE. JUST BECAUSE YOU TAKE THAT ONE STEP DOESN'T MEAN YOU FOUND THE PERFECT SOLUTION, AND WE FIND THAT AS WE LEGISLATE EVERY DAY. VERY FEW BILLS THAT WE PUSH THROUGH HERE ARE GOING TO BE PERFECT FOREVER. TIMES CHANGE. WE'VE HAD MEMBERS RAISE THAT UPCOMING ELECTIONS THAT AREN'T THIS LEGISLATURE WILL USE A SECRET BALLOT AND THAT WHEN WE GO INTO THE PERSONAL BALLOT BOX IT'S A SECRET BALLOT. I SUPPORT THE CONCEPT OF THE INDIVIDUAL SECRET BALLOT, BUT AS MY COLLEAGUES KNOW, WE ARE IN A REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY. WE ARE EACH REPRESENTED BY 40,000 PEOPLE TO COME AND REPRESENT THEIR

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

INTERESTS. AND THOSE PEOPLE SHOULD KNOW WHAT WE'RE DOING AND WHO WE'RE SUPPORTING AND WHAT BILLS THAT WE SUPPORT, WHAT AMENDMENTS WE VOTE FOR IN THE REPRESENTATION OF THEIR INTERESTS. IT'S AS SIMPLE AS THAT. THERE'S A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SECRET BALLOT WHEN I GO IN AND VOTE PERSONALLY AT NORTHEAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE IN O'NEILL, AND WHEN I WALK DOWN HERE ON THE FLOOR OF THE LEGISLATURE AND STAND UP FOR THE 39,000 PEOPLE THAT SENT ME TO DO THIS JOB. THEY DESERVE TO KNOW WHAT I'M DOING. I THINK MR. GROENE, SENATOR GROENE, BROUGHT UP A GOOD POINT. WE HAVE TO BE ACCOUNTABLE TO THOSE WE REPRESENT. I UNDERSTAND THAT WE'VE SEEN ARTICLES AND ISSUES COME UP ABOUT HAVING TO WORK WITH EVERY MEMBER OF THIS BODY AND THAT THE SECRET BALLOT COULD HURT FEELINGS OR DESTROY RELATIONSHIPS. YOU KNOW, I KNOW SENATOR MORFELD ISN'T GOING TO AGREE WITH ME ON VOTER ID. I'M PRETTY SURE I SAW IN THE PAPER THAT HE THREATENED A LAWSUIT IF VOTER ID GOES. BUT YOU KNOW WHAT? WHEN I SEE SENATOR MORFELD LATER, WHEREVER IT MAY BE, IS THAT GOING TO STOP ME FROM HAVING A BEER WITH HIM? PROBABLY NOT. THE CONCEPT HERE IS WE'RE ADULTS. I CAN NO LONGER CLAIM BEING THE YOUNGEST MEMBER OF THE LEGISLATURE.

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE.

SENATOR LARSON: SENATOR HANSEN HAS THAT HONOR. AND I'M NOT EVEN SURE IF I'M THE SECOND YOUNGEST MEMBER. I'M NOT SURE WHEN SENATOR MORFELD'S BIRTHDAY IS. BUT I AT LEAST UNDERSTAND THAT I'M GOING TO DISAGREE WITH EVERYBODY IN THIS BODY AT ONE POINT OR ANOTHER AND HOPEFULLY...AND SOME MEMBERS AREN'T GOING TO LIKE ME. YOU KNOW, I UNDERSTAND THAT TOO. SENATOR CHAMBERS, I KNOW, HE'S SHAKING HIS HEAD. HE DOESN'T LIKE ME. THAT'S FINE. BUT I STILL HAVE TO WORK WITH SENATOR CHAMBERS OR AROUND HIM, IF I CAN MANAGE THAT, WHICH HAPPENS SOMETIMES TOO. BUT WE HAVE TO WORK TOGETHER. AND REGARDLESS IF I DISAGREE WITH YOU OR IF YOU DIDN'T VOTE FOR ME FOR CHAIR, I'M STILL GOING TO WORK WITH YOU BECAUSE I STILL WANT TO DO THINGS IN THIS LEGISLATURE AND I STILL WANT TO REPRESENT...

SPEAKER HADLEY: TIME, SENATOR.

SENATOR LARSON: ...MY DISTRICT TO THE BEST OF MY ABILITY.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR McCOLLISTER. OH, I SKIPPED AGAIN. SENATOR CHAMBERS.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I'M ONE OF THOSE

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

PEOPLE WHO CAN BE THE ONLY PERSON IN THE PHONE BOOTH AND BE LOST, SO IT'S NOT UNUSUAL FOR ME TO BE OVERLOOKED AND I DON'T EVEN THINK ABOUT IT. I WASN'T GOING TO SAY ANYTHING ON THIS AT ALL OTHER THAN TO GIVE THE MANTRA OF THE KING COBRA, WHICH IS THE KING COBRA WASTES NO VENOM ON DEAD OR FLEEING THINGS. THIS IS GOING NOWHERE, BUT I THINK A COMMENT OR TWO NEEDS TO BE MADE ANYWAY. SENATOR...THE GUY BACK THERE WHO KNOWS I DON'T LIKE HIM SAID THAT HE'S NOT SURE WHETHER HE'S THE YOUNGEST PERSON. WELL, HE KNOWS HE'S NOT THE YOUNGEST BUT HE DOESN'T KNOW WHAT ORDER AS FAR AS FROM THAT POINT ONWARD WOULD BE. THERE'S NO DOUBT THAT I AM THE OLDEST PERSON HERE. SO ON AN ISSUE LIKE THIS, THE OLD PERSON HAS TO SPEAK UP FOR THE OLDER SETTLERS IN THE GENERATION OF POPULATION. THIS IS NOT A MATTER OF CARRYING ON OR CARRYING OUT THE PUBLIC'S BUSINESS. THAT'S SOMETHING THAT A POLITICAL PARTY WOULD TELL ITS MINIONS. THIS IS A MATTER OF INTERNAL ORGANIZATION, PURE AND SIMPLE, NOTHING DEEP, NOTHING PROFOUND, NOTHING MYSTERIOUS. IT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH BEING A REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY. I'M SURE THE ONES WHO SAY THEY WANT THIS PUBLICIZED WOULD NOT SAY THEY WANT THE ORGANIZATIONS THAT SUPPORT THEM, AND HAVE MEMBERS WHO DON'T WANT THEIR IDENTITY DISCLOSED, SAY THAT THEY'LL DISCLOSE THE IDENTITY OF THOSE PEOPLE SO THE PUBLIC KNOWS WHO IS SUPPORTING THEM AND WHO THEY ARE LIKELY TO CHEESE UP TO. SO THEY JUST SAY WORDS WITHOUT THINKING. WOULD THEY WANT TO PUBLICIZE EVERY TIME THEY TALK TO A LOBBYIST AND WHAT THEY SAY? THE LOBBYISTS ARE THE ONES WHO ARE GOING TO INFLUENCE THEM. DO THEY WANT THE CONTENT OF EVERY PHONE CALL MADE TO OR FROM THEIR OFFICE PUBLICIZED? THAT'S SUPPOSED TO BE CARRYING ON THE PUBLIC'S BUSINESS. YOU'RE USING A PUBLIC-PAID-FOR INSTRUMENTALITY. ARE YOU GOING TO DO THAT? THIS THING IS GOING NOWHERE AT ALL. AND MY COLLEAGUES, AS MUCH AS I HAVE DISPARAGED YOU SO FAR IN THIS EARLY SESSION--AND THERE WILL BE MORE TO COME, DON'T WORRY--MY COLLEAGUES ARE TOO SMART TO GO FOR NONSENSE SUCH AS THIS. AND FOR SOMEBODY TO STAND ON THE FLOOR AND EQUATE INTERNAL ORGANIZATION WITH THE OPERATION OF THE REPUBLIC IS PROFOUNDLY NAIVE, PROFOUNDLY SIMPLEMINDED, OR PROFOUNDLY DISINGENUOUS. THEY NEED TO GO BACK TO HIGH SCHOOL AND TAKE SOME CIVICS COURSES. WE ARE ALL ADULTS IN HERE AND THEY BRING THIS CHILDISH DRIVEL AND THINK THEY'RE GOING TO MAKE SOMEBODY SAY, WELL, YEAH, I THINK I NEED TO LET THEM KNOW EVERYTHING I DO BECAUSE I'M REPRESENTING THE PUBLIC. YOU GOING TO TELL THEM EVERY TIME YOU GO TO THE BATHROOM AND WHAT YOU DO WHEN YOU'RE IN THERE? THAT'S BUSINESS. YOU GOING TO TELL THEM THAT? YOU SEE HOW FOOLISH THIS IS? SOMEBODY NEEDS TO SAY THESE THINGS. AND OTHERS THINK THEM, BUT THEY WON'T BE IN THE RECORD. THE PUBLIC

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

NEEDS TO BE AWARE, IN THE INTEREST OF TRANSPARENCY, THAT THERE'S AT LEAST ONE PERSON ON THIS FLOOR WHO'S GOING TO CALL THIS KIND OF DRIVEL EXACTLY WHAT IT IS. THEY DON'T HAVE TO CALL ANY OF THESE SENATORS PERSONALLY WHO SAY I NEVER TALK TO THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE, SENATOR.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: YOU CAN READ THE NEWSPAPER. THEY MAKE IT CLEAR WHAT THEY WANT YOU TO DO, AND I'VE SEEN YOU DO IT. DON'T FORGET HOW LONG I'VE BEEN AROUND HERE. OTHER PEOPLE MAY NOT OR, IF THEY WERE HERE, THEY WERE NOT PAYING ATTENTION. I'VE SEEN SO MUCH HYPOCRISY ON THIS FLOOR THAT WOULD BE ENOUGH TO FILL THIS WHOLE ROOM IF EACH ACT OF HYPOCRISY WERE THE SIZE OF A MICROBE. YOU ALL KNOW IT, AND YOU'LL SEE MORE OF IT. YOU WILL NEVER HEAR ME STAND UP HERE AND PLAY LIKE I'M SOMETHING OTHER THAN WHAT I AM OR PLAY LIKE I'M ON SOME HIGHFALUTIN, MORAL CRUSADE WHEN ALL I'M DOING IS PLAYING GUTTER POLITICS. I LISTENED AND WATCHED HOW THE REPUBLICAN PARTY CARRIED ON ELECTIONS. I WATCHED A MEMBER OF THIS BODY TAKE A BOBBLE-HEAD DOLL OF PRESIDENT OBAMA AND KNOCK IT OFF A FENCE POST. EVEN "REPELICANS" WERE EMBARRASSED BY THAT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: TIME, SENATOR.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THAT'S THE LOUDEST I'VE HEARD YOU SPEAK TODAY, BUT MESSAGE RECEIVED. (LAUGHTER)

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR McCOLLISTER.

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. AND I WANT TO THANK MY ESTEEMED COLLEAGUE FOR DEFENDING THE OLDER MEMBERS OF THE BODY. I RISE IN OPPOSITION TO THE KINTNER AMENDMENT. THE SALVATION OF THE STATE IS THE WATCHFULNESS OF THE CITIZEN. WE ALL KNOW THIS FAMOUS STATEMENT BY HARTLEY BURR ALEXANDER IS ETCHED OVER THE NORTH PORTICO OF THE CAPITOL. THESE NOBLE WORDS DESCRIBE THE ESSENCE OF GOOD PRACTICES IN GOVERNMENT, AND AN ELECTED BODY SHOULD FOLLOW THESE PRACTICES. DURING MY FOUR YEARS AT THE PLATTE INSTITUTE, THERE WAS NO GREATER ADVOCATE FOR TRANSPARENCY IN GOVERNMENT THAN THAT GROUP. WE STARTED THE FIRST WEB SITE TO RECORD THE VOTES OF STATE SENATORS. WE ALSO PUBLISHED ALL THE SALARIES OVER \$100,000 OF EVERY STATE EMPLOYEE. IN FACT, THAT QUOTE IS SO IMPORTANT THAT WE ETCHED THAT QUOTE AND PRINTED THAT QUOTE ON THE BACK OF OUR BUSINESS CARDS. I DON'T

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

BELIEVE ANYBODY IN THIS BODY HAS PROMOTED TRANSPARENCY MORE THAN I HAVE IN THE LAST FOUR TO SIX YEARS. BUT THE VOTE FOR COMMITTEE CHAIRS IS FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT--FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT. THESE VOTES ARE INTERNAL ORGANIZATIONAL PROCEDURES AND THEY HAVE NO IMPACT ON STATE POLICY, TAXES, OR REGULATIONS. DURING THE CAMPAIGN, POLITICAL CAMPAIGN WE JUST FINISHED, PEOPLE GAVE ME THE OVERPOWERING MESSAGE: FOR GOD'S SAKE, DON'T MAKE LINCOLN, NEBRASKA, JUST LIKE OUR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT; DON'T TURN THAT INTO A PARTISAN SNAKE PIT LIKE WE HAVE IN THAT CITY. SO I ENCOURAGE YOU TO VOTE AGAINST THIS AMENDMENT AND MOVE THE BODY FORWARD. I YIELD THE REST OF MY TIME, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: NEXT, THE CHAIR RECOGNIZES SENATOR SCHILZ.

SENATOR SCHILZ: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE BODY. GOOD AFTERNOON. I HAVE SAT HERE AND LISTENED TO THE ARGUMENTS AND THE DEBATES INTENTLY, AND I JUST WANT TO SAY THAT I BELIEVE THAT THERE ARE TIMES WHEN DISCUSSIONS NEED TO BE HAD, AND ONE OF THOSE TIMES IS WHEN WE BRING THE RULES TO THE FLOOR TO DECIDE IF THAT'S THE WAY WE WANT TO CONDUCT BUSINESS GOING FORWARD. SO WHETHER YOU BELIEVE IN SECRET BALLOTS OR WHETHER YOU BELIEVE IN OPEN BALLOTS, THAT DOESN'T MATTER, BECAUSE EITHER ONE IS OKAY. LET'S THINK ABOUT IT FOR A SECOND. I CAME IN HERE UNDER TERM LIMITS. I KNEW AT MOST I'D HAVE EIGHT YEARS. PEOPLE THAT CAME BEFORE ME KNEW THEY HAD MORE TIME, BUT WE ALL OPERATE UNDER THE RULES THAT WE'RE GIVEN, AND EVERYTHING MOVES FORWARD. TELL ME THIS. IF WE ALL HAD OPEN BALLOTS TO VOTE FOR FOLKS BEFORE WE ALL GOT HERE WOULD WE THINK THAT WAS A BAD THING OR WOULD WE JUST THINK THAT'S THE WAY IT'S BEEN DONE? NOW, WE ALL HAVE TO BE CAREFUL BECAUSE ONE OF THE MOST DANGEROUS THINGS IN THE WHOLE WORLD IS TO SAY, GUYS, THAT'S THE WAY WE'VE ALWAYS DONE IT. AND EVEN HERE WE'VE SHOWN AND WE'VE PROVEN THAT THIS IS NOT THE WAY THAT WE'VE ALWAYS DONE IT. I UNDERSTAND THE REASONS FOR A SECRET BALLOT. I KNOW THAT AN OPEN BALLOT CAN MAKE PEOPLE UNCOMFORTABLE, BUT I THINK, I'M PRETTY SURE, THE VAST MAJORITY OF US PUT UP OUR NAMES TO RUN FOR OFFICE, WHICH MEANS WE TOOK THE RISK OF SAYING, HEY, I'M WILLING TO LOSE. FOLKS, IF THERE'S ANY OF US UP HERE THAT TAKE THAT GOING FORWARD AND DECIDE THAT THEY'RE GOING TO TURN INTO SOMEBODY THAT'S VINDICTIVE OR SOMEBODY THAT DOESN'T WANT TO PLAY NICE WITH EVERYBODY ONCE THEY FIND OUT THEY'VE LOST A RACE INTERNALLY HERE IN THE LEGISLATURE, WELL, THEN LET'S FIND OUT WHO THOSE FOLKS ARE BECAUSE I CAN TELL YOU WHAT. IF SOMEBODY WOULD HAVE RUN AGAINST ME FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND THOSE PEOPLE WOULD HAVE WON AND I WOULD

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

HAVE KNOWN WHO VOTED FOR EVERYBODY, WELL, GUESS WHAT? TOMORROW I STILL NEED TO COME BACK WITH MY BILLS AND GET 25 VOTES, JUST LIKE YOU GUYS DO. TRUST ME. WHEN YOU WANT YOUR BILL TO GO FORWARD, YOU WILL FIGURE OUT A WAY TO WORK WITH FOLKS. I'M NOT GOING TO TELL YOU HOW TO VOTE ON THIS THING BECAUSE THAT'S YOUR DECISION. IT'S EACH ONE OF OUR DECISIONS HERE IN THE LEGISLATURE. BUT I'M NOT GOING TO TELL YOU THAT YOU'RE NOT SMART IF YOU VOTE AGAINST THE WAY THAT I BELIEVE, BECAUSE I KNOW, AS I LOOK AROUND HERE, THAT'S NOT TRUE. SO, FOLKS, THINK ABOUT THESE VOTES, DO WHAT YOU NEED TO DO, AND THEN LET'S MOVE FORWARD WHATEVER THE CASE MAY BE TO MAKE THIS SESSION SUCCESSFUL FOR ALL OF US, BECAUSE I KNOW WE CAN DO THAT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR BLOOMFIELD, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. COLLEAGUES, I HAVE OPPOSED THIS IDEA SINCE ITS INCEPTION, NOT BECAUSE I'M ASHAMED OF WHO I VOTE FOR. I DON'T THINK SENATOR NORDQUIST WOULD BE STUNNED TO FIND OUT THAT I DIDN'T VOTE FOR HIM FOR RETIREMENT. I DON'T BELIEVE SENATOR HADLEY WILL FALL OUT OF HIS CHAIR WHEN I SAY I VOTED FOR THE OTHER MEMBER FOR SPEAKER. BUT I WANT TO TAKE THE WORDS OF A CONSTITUENT OF MINE THAT HAPPENED TO BE IN THE CHAIR, UP IN THE BALCONY TODAY. I CAUGHT HIM OUT ON THE FLOOR WHEN WE WE'RE DONE. I SAID, DOES IT MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE TO YOU WHO I VOTE FOR, FOR SPEAKER OR FOR CHAIRMAN OF A COMMITTEE? AND HE SAID, NOT IN THE SLIGHTEST BECAUSE YOU HAVE WORKED WITH THEM. YOU KNOW WHO IS BEST ABLE TO FILL THAT POSITION. WE OUT HERE DON'T KNOW THE INTRICACIES THAT YOU HAVE WORKED WITH. SO I BELIEVE PASSING THIS AMENDMENT WOULD BE A BAD IDEA. SENATOR KINTNER AND I AGREE ON ABOUT 90 PERCENT OF THE THINGS THAT COME DOWN THE PIKE. THIS HAPPENS TO BE ONE WE DON'T. SENATOR SCHNOOR WAS GIVEN THE TASK OF BRINGING THIS BEFORE OUR RULES COMMITTEE. HE DID AN ADMIRABLE JOB. I THINK SENATOR SCHNOOR IS GOING TO BE A FABULOUS SENATOR HERE. I HAD ONE OF OUR MEMBERS COME UP TO ME SINCE WE CAME BACK FROM LUNCH AND SAID, WELL, IT WON'T AFFECT YOU, YOU'RE NOT RUNNING AGAIN; BUT I THINK SENATOR GARRETT WILL GET A LOT OF BLOWBACK FROM THIS, AND I DON'T WANT TO MENTION IT TO HIM BECAUSE I DON'T WANT HIM THINKING I'M TRYING TO INTIMIDATE HIM. WELL, I'VE HAD THE PRIVILEGE OF SITTING FAIRLY CLOSE TO SENATOR GARRETT FOR A YEAR OR SO NOW. HE DOESN'T INTIMIDATE THAT EASILY, FOLKS. I THINK WE'RE GOING TO SEE THE SAME THING FROM SENATOR SCHNOOR. HE IS GOING TO TAKE THIS, IN WHAT I HOPE IS A DEFEAT, HE WILL TAKE IT GRACIOUSLY AND WE WILL MOVE ON. BUT I OPPOSE THIS IDEA. I THINK IT WOULD DO IRREPARABLE HARM TO THE

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

BODY. THANK YOU.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR KOLOWSKI, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR KOLOWSKI: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I APPRECIATE THAT VERY MUCH. GOOD AFTERNOON, SENATORS. I STAND IN OPPOSITION ALSO TO THIS MOTION AND I'D LIKE TO READ FROM SOME NEWSPAPER CLIPPINGS THAT I HAVE QUITE A FILE ON. THIS IS AN OMAHA WORLD-HERALD, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 14: NEW SENATORS, BIG CHALLENGES. I CUT THESE OUT BECAUSE THERE'S SOME INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY THAT THE NEWSPAPERS SOMETIMES GIVE US THAT WE WON'T ALWAYS HAVE IN THIS FACILITY BECAUSE OF TERM LIMITS. THINGS LAST WITH STAFF. THINGS LAST WITH LOBBYISTS. BUT SENATORS COME AND GO VERY QUICKLY IN A TERM LIMITED WORLD, AND THAT IS AN IMPACT UPON WHERE WE ARE AND WHAT WE GET DONE. YOU HEARD THE HISTORY PARTIALLY OF THIS VOTING EARLIER TODAY, NUMBER OF DECADES THAT WE'VE BEEN IN THE SAME MODE DOING THIS IN THE SAME WAY. AND I WOULD POINT OUT AGAIN WHAT SENATOR CHAMBERS SAID. THIS IS AN INTERNAL STRUCTURE ISSUE AND QUESTION; HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH OTHER ASPECTS OF OUR DECISIONS ABOUT OUR STATE AND WHERE WE'RE GOING. SO EVEN IF YOU COUNTED IT AS ONE OF THOSE ITEMS, WE'RE 99.99999 PERCENT TRANSPARENT ON EVERYTHING ELSE WE DO. JUST CONSIDER THAT. I APPRECIATED SENATOR McCOLLISTER'S COMMENTS AS WELL. THE THINGS WE'RE TRYING TO DO, I THINK, ARE VERY REFLECTIVE OF A SUMMER EXPERIENCE SENATOR MURANTE AND SENATOR WATERMEIER AND I HAD LAST SUMMER AT THE BILLD CONFERENCE IN MADISON, WISCONSIN. WE SAT THERE AS A TRIO LISTENING TO ALL THESE OTHER STATES AROUND US AND PROVINCES IN CANADA TALK ABOUT THE PARTISAN DIFFICULTIES THEY HAVE IN THEIR STATE AND THE LACK OF PROGRESS THEY MAKE IN THEIR ENDEAVORS TRYING TO SOLVE THE PROBLEMS IN THEIR STATES. THEY COULDN'T BELIEVE WHAT WE DO. IT WAS SHOCKING TO THEM THAT WE HAVE ONE HOUSE AND ALL THOSE POWER BASES ARE NOT OUT THERE AS THEY ARE IN THEIR OWN STATES, IN THEIR OWN OPERATIONS. SO THERE'S A LOT TO BE THANKFUL FOR AND A LOT TO BE LEARNED AS WE LOOK AT WHERE WE ARE AND WHAT WE'RE DOING. FROM THIS ARTICLE ON NOVEMBER 14, I WANT TO TALK ABOUT...JUST READ A SEGMENT OF THIS ON INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT. "INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT IS A MUST. SUCCESSFUL LAWMAKERS UNDERSTAND THAT THEY NEED TO EXERCISE THEIR OWN JUDGMENT WHEN DECIDING THINGS. THE GUIDING PRINCIPLE SHOULD BE, 'WHAT'S IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE STATE?'--NOT WHAT'S BEST FOR A POLITICAL PARTY, INTEREST GROUP, OR THE GOVERNOR." NEXT, "THE INFLUX OF NEW MEMBERS WILL BRING CHANGE, AND NEW IDEAS ARE ALWAYS WELCOME. AT THE SAME TIME, LAWMAKERS WOULD BE WISE TO PROCEED CAUTIOUSLY WHEN IT COMES TO CHANGING TIME-TESTED RULES

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

AND PROCEDURES OR REARRANGING COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS. COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSONS SHOULD BE CHOSEN BASED ON ABILITIES AND EXPERTISE, NOT PARTISAN AFFILIATION, AS THEY ARE IN WASHINGTON." THERE ARE SOME WORDS OF WISDOM AND DIFFERENT THINGS THAT YOU CAN FIND AND READ AND LISTEN TO TODAY, AND I HOPE WE CAN DEFEAT THIS MOTION AND MOVE ON TO THE OTHER WORK THAT WE HAVE TO GET DONE. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR GARRETT, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR GARRETT: MR. SPEAKER, I, TOO, BELIEVE IN TRANSPARENCY. ALL OF OUR VOTES ON COMMITTEE AND THE VOTES ON THE FLOOR ARE OPEN FOR EVERYONE TO SEE AND, YOU KNOW, MY CONSTITUENTS CAN JUDGE ME ON HOW I VOTE ON THE ISSUES. I COME IN HERE EVERY DAY WITH MY BIG BOY UNDERPANTS ON AND I'M WILLING TO TAKE THE HEAT FOR WHAT I BELIEVE IN AND I'M TRYING TO REPRESENT MY CONSTITUENTS. I LOVE THIS INSTITUTION. I AM SO HONORED AND HUMBLD TO BE A PART OF IT. AND THE FOUNDATION OF THIS INSTITUTION IS OUR CONSTITUTION. WE HAVE A VERY UNIQUE SYSTEM, AS SENATOR KOLOWSKI HAD MENTIONED, YOU KNOW, IN THAT WE'RE A UNICAMERAL AND WE'RE A NONPARTISAN UNICAMERAL. THAT'S PROBABLY ONE OF THE MOST UNIQUE CHARACTERISTICS OF THAT--NONPARTISANSHIP. AND OUR CONSTITUTION CALLS FOR US TO BE NONPARTISAN. WHEN I GOT SWORN INTO THE AIR FORCE, I SWORE TO SUPPORT AND DEFEND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES. WE TOOK AN OATH WHEN WE BECAME STATE SENATORS AS WELL TO SUPPORT THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF NEBRASKA. THAT CONSTITUTION CALLS FOR US TO BE NONPARTISAN AND FOR MY COLLEAGUES WHO ARGUE THAT THIS IS NOT ABOUT PARTISANSHIP, YOU KNOW, A CLASSIC EXAMPLE, I THINK, IS THE OMAHA WORLD-HERALD THIS MORNING WHERE THE COUNTY COMMISSIONER...COUNTY GOP LEADER IS PROPOSING TO CENSURE SENATOR BOB KRIST. AND HE SAID THAT HE WAS DISAPPOINTED THAT KRIST HAD VOTED COUNTER TO THE COUNTY PARTY'S PUBLICLY STATED POSITION ON SECRET LEADERSHIP BALLOTS. OKAY? SO THERE'S A PERFECT EXAMPLE OF THAT PARTISANSHIP. YOU KNOW, IF WE HAVE TO TOE THE PARTY LINE ON WHO WE VOTE FOR, FOR COMMITTEE CHAIRS AND THE SPEAKER, YOU KNOW, WE'VE GIVEN UP CONTROL OF THIS INSTITUTION. AND SO I'M A FIRM SUPPORTER OF THE CONSTITUTION. THE CONSTITUTION SAYS WE SHOULD BE NONPARTISAN AND, UNLESS WE ARE WILLING TO CHANGE THE CONSTITUTION, I'M GOING TO OPPOSE THIS AMENDMENT BY SENATOR KINTNER ON TRANSPARENCY. THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR JOHNSON, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED.

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

SENATOR JOHNSON: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER. AS YOU KNOW, I RAN ONE OF THE CLOSEST RACES WHEN WE ELECTED COMMITTEE CHAIRS, CAN'T GET ANY CLOSER. AND GOING INTO THE DAY I THOUGHT I HAD MAYBE THREE VOTES EXTRA, MAYBE FIVE. I WON BY ONE. I DON'T KNOW WHO THOSE THREE OR FOUR OR FIVE THAT MIGHT HAVE CHANGED THEIR MIND, AND, TRUE, I WON SO IT'S HISTORY. I DON'T CARE. YOU KNOW, I'M NOT GOING TO FOCUS ON WHY SOMEBODY CHANGED. LUCKILY, BOTH SENATOR BRASCH AND I ARE THE SAME PARTY SO IT DID NOT BECOME A PARTY ISSUE. I MIGHT HAVE FELT A LITTLE BIT DIFFERENT, I SUPPOSE, IF I WOULD HAVE LOST, BUT MY MIND-SET IS GET OVER IT. I DIDN'T WANT TO KNOW. I STILL DON'T WANT TO KNOW WHO CHANGED THEIR MIND OR WHO VOTED AGAINST ME. THAT'S HISTORY. I'M COMFORTABLE WITH WHERE WE'RE AT RIGHT NOW. I DEFINITELY OPPOSE THE AMENDMENT ON THE FLOOR. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE. I WISH THAT PEOPLE HAD AN APPROPRIATE RESPECT FOR HISTORY. THAT'S NOT TO SAY THAT EVERYTHING THAT IS IN A HISTORY BOOK IS ACCURATE, THAT IT'S TRUE EVEN, THAT IT'S UNBIASED. BUT AT LEAST IT TRIES TO BRING TO PEOPLE IN THE PRESENT INFORMATION ABOUT THINGS THAT HAPPENED IN THE PAST. THEN YOU DRAW YOUR OWN CONCLUSIONS. ANYBODY WHO'S GOING TO WRITE HISTORY, SINCE HE OR SHE CAN'T WRITE EVERYTHING, IS GOING TO HAVE TO MAKE DECISIONS AND CHOICES AS TO WHAT IS GOING TO BE INCLUDED, WHAT WILL BE EXCLUDED. SO THERE'S NO SUCH THING AS AN OBJECTIVE HISTORY. EVEN OBITUARIES ARE NOT OBJECTIVE AND THEY CERTAINLY ARE NOT TRUE, BUT EVERYBODY ACCEPTS THAT AS THE WAY THAT IT IS. FOR ANYBODY AS OLD AS THE PEOPLE ARE ON THIS FLOOR, EVEN THE YOUNGEST, TO COME HERE AND TALK ABOUT THIS NONSENSE HAS ANYTHING TO DO WITH TRANSPARENCY OF GOVERNMENT BOGGLES MY MIND. AND MAYBE I HAVE REACHED THE POINT OF AGE WHERE I'VE LOST CONTACT WITH REALITY, NOT ALL REALITY, HOWEVER. MAYBE THE NEW REALITY, WHICH IS BASED ON AN APPEARANCE, A SHOWING, A SHAM WHERE THEY HAVE DEVICES WHICH WILL ALLOW YOU TO APPEAR ON A SCREEN AND HAVE DIFFERENT CLOTHES IN THE POP OF A FINGER WITHOUT CHANGING YOUR CLOTHES, LOOK THINNER, LOOK LIKE YOU'RE SOMEPLACE WITH PEOPLE. AND THEY'RE OVER THERE, YOU'RE HERE. AND MAYBE SOME OF THEM ARE DEAD BUT THEY ALL HAVE THE APPEARANCE OF BEING ALIVE. THIS IS A SHAM SOCIETY, AND THEY THINK WHEN THEY COME TO THIS BODY BY MERELY CLOAKING NONSENSE IN WORDS THAT MIGHT HAVE SENSE IT'S GOING TO TAKE ON MORE VALIDITY THAN IT HAS. I COULD BE LIKE THAT LITTLE CRITTER IN BAMBI WHO WAS YOUNG AND BUMPTIOUS AS ARE YOUNG

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

CRITTERS AND DON'T KNOW ONE THING FROM ANOTHER AND REFERRED TO A LITTLE PERSON AS FLOWER. AND THIS LITTLE PERSON WOULD NOT GIVE OFF THE AROMA OR THE SCENT OR THE FRAGRANCE OF LAVENDER BEING WAFTED THROUGH THE AIR, BECAUSE THE LITTLE CRITTER SHE CALLED A FLOWER OR HE CALLED A FLOWER WAS IN FACT A SKUNK. CALLING THAT A FLOWER DID NOT MAKE IT SO. STANDING UP HERE WITH A SHALLOW UNDERSTANDING OF HISTORY OR NONE WHATSOEVER, CERTAINLY NO BACKGROUND IN POLITICAL SCIENCE, NO UNDERSTANDING BECAUSE THEY'VE NEVER READ THE DEBATES THAT WENT ON AMONG THOSE MEN NAMED AS FOREFATHERS. YOUR FOREFATHERS, NOT MINE. NOBODY BLACK WAS THERE. BUT THEY WERE...SOME OF THEM WERE THE FATHER OF PEOPLE OF MY COMPLEXION. I'M GOING TO DIGRESS NOW BECAUSE THIS THING IS GOING NOWHERE. IT'S NOT WORTH IT. BUT THERE WAS SOME "REPELICAN" DOWN IN VIRGINIA AND HE WAS SERVING TIME FOR INAPPROPRIATE SEXUAL MISBEHAVIOR WITH AN UNDERAGE GIRL AND HE WAS ELECTED TO OFFICE WHILE HE WAS SERVING TIME, AND HE SHOULD HAVE BEEN. ALL HE HAS TO DO IS SAY, ALL I'M DOING IS GETTING INTO THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES. WHY, THOMAS JEFFERSON OWNED YOUNG BLACK GIRLS AND FATHERED CHILDREN ON THEM AND HE BECAME PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES. GEORGE WASHINGTON...

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...LIVED IN VIRGINIA. HE HAD INAPPROPRIATE RELATIONSHIPS WITH BLACK WOMEN. AND WHEN THAT GUY THEY LOVE TO QUOTE SO MUCH WHO CAME FROM ENGLAND, AND I'M NOT GOING TO GIVE YOU HIS NAME BUT YOU CAN FIND IT. GOOGLE IT. HE SAID HE CAME TO THESE PLANTATIONS AND WHAT SURPRISED HIM IS THAT THEY HAD LITTLE BLACK CHILDREN AND LITTLE WHITE CHILDREN AND THE ONLY DIFFERENCE WAS IN THE COMPLEXION BECAUSE THEY ALL LOOKED THE SAME BECAUSE THEY HAD THE SAME DADDY. AND NOW ALL THIS HYPOCRISY ABOUT THIS GUY DOING WHAT THE SO-CALLED FOUNDING FATHERS DID. CAN'T BE IN OFFICE, AND THEY BECAME PRESIDENT. CALL IT LIKE IT IS. BUT YOU WON'T READ HISTORY. AND WHEN THE TRUTH OF HISTORY COMES OUT YOU PEOPLE SAY, OH, YOU'RE ATTACKING AMERICA, YOU WANT TO BRING AMERICA DOWN. IF THEY COMMITTED THE KIND OF ACTS THAT SHOULD BRING THEM DOWN, LET THEM COME DOWN. BUT DON'T LIE TO THESE CHILDREN, MAKE THEM THINK THESE ARE PARAGONS OF VIRTUE. THEN WHEN THEY DO SOME INDEPENDENT READING AND FIND OUT ON THEIR OWN...

SPEAKER HADLEY: TIME, SENATOR. SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED.

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. FIND OUT ON THEIR OWN WHAT HAPPENED, THEY ARE EVEN MORE BITTER BECAUSE THEY HAD RAISED THESE PEOPLE SO HIGH. IF THEY HAD BEEN TAUGHT THAT THESE ARE HUMAN BEINGS, ALL HUMAN BEINGS HAVE FEET OF CLAY. THEY LOOK OUT THERE AND SEE A PRETTY WOMAN AND THEY'LL GO GAGA OR WHATEVER YOU YOUNG PEOPLE CALL IT NOW. KING DAVID, WHO WROTE THE PSALMS AND DESCRIBED HIMSELF AS THE APPLE OF GOD'S EYE, LOOKED OVER THERE, THE PEEPING TOM THAT HE WAS, AND SAW A WOMAN TAKING A BATH, AND SHE HAPPENED TO BE THE WIFE OF HIS TOP GENERAL. SO HE SAID, I WANT THAT. AND THE KING CAN DO NO WRONG, AND HE GOT THAT BY SENDING HIS TOP GENERAL, THE MAN WHO WAS MOST LOYAL TO HIM, WHO WOULD GIVE HIS LIFE FOR HIM, KING DAVID TOLD HIS COMMANDERS, BECAUSE THIS MAN HAS COURAGE AND HE'S LOYAL TO ME, I WANT YOU TO TAKE HIM TO THE GATES OF THE CITY WHERE THE ATTACK IS BEING LAUNCHED AND THERE THE BATTLE WILL BE THE HOTTEST. AND WHEN HE'S IN THE THICK OF THE BATTLE, WITHDRAW FROM HIM. AND THAT'S WHAT THEY DID AND HE WAS KILLED. AND DAVID TOOK THAT MAN'S WIFE. THEN AN OLD PROPHET CAME TO HIM NAMED NATHAN. AND HE SAID, DAVID, THERE WAS A RICH MAN IN YOUR KINGDOM, HE HAD SHEEP AS FAR AS THE EYE COULD SEE AND HE LOOKED ACROSS THE WAY AND SAW A MAN WITH ONE EWE LAMB AND HE TOOK THAT LAMB. AND DAVID WAS IRATE AND TOLD WHAT TERRIBLE THINGS OUGHT TO HAPPEN TO A MAN WHO'D DO SUCH A THING. AND THAT PROPHET POINTED THAT BONY FINGER AT THE KING AND LOOKED HIM IN THE EYE AND SAID, DAVID, THOU ART THE MAN. AND DAVID WAS SMITTEN IN HIS HEART, AS THEY WERE IN THESE BIBLICAL MYTHS. AND WHEN THE CHILD WAS BORN, THE CHILD GREW SICKLY. AND DAVID PUT ON SACKCLOTH AND LAY AROUND IN THE ASHES, WHICH WAS WHAT THEY DID IN THOSE DAYS. SPITTLE DRIBBLED DOWN HIS BEARD. HE WOULDN'T BATHE, WOULDN'T ANYTHING, TRYING TO ASK THIS GOD TO NOT TAKE THE LITTLE BABY. AND WHEN THE CHILD DIED, DAVID GOT UP, TOOK A BATH, COMBED HIS HAIR, SHAPED HIS BEARD AS STYLISHLY AS "GENERAL" GARRETT THERE. AND THE PEOPLE CAME TO HIM. THEY SAID, WHEN THE CHILD WAS ALIVE, DESCRIBED WHAT HE DID. AND NOW THAT THE CHILD IS DEAD, YOU'VE DONE AS YOU'VE DONE. YOU'RE GOING ABOUT YOUR BUSINESS. WHY IS THAT? DAVID SAID, AS LONG AS THE CHILD WAS ALIVE I THOUGHT MAYBE I COULD PREVAIL ON GOD TO GIVE THE CHILD AND ME A BREAK. BUT NOW THAT THE CHILD IS DEAD THERE'S NOTHING THAT CAN BE DONE. I SHALL GO UNTO HIM BUT HE CAN NEVER COME TO ME. THE POINT I WANT YOU TO KEEP IN MIND IS THAT THERE ARE THINGS THAT PEOPLE DO WHO ARE IN POLITICS AND THEY MISLABEL IT. BUT WHEN YOU COME TO POLITICS AND POLITICIANS, POLITICIANS WOULD DO ANYTHING. THEY WILL SAY ANYTHING, AND JUST LOOK AT THE CAMPAIGNING BEFORE. I WAS OUTRAGED AT THE ATTACKS MADE ON MY FORMER COLLEAGUE, SENATOR ASHFORD--ONE OF THE GENTLEST, MOST

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

NONCONFRONTATIONAL PEOPLE YOU CAN FIND. AND THE HEAD OF THE POLICE UNION HELD UP A BULLET AND SAID SENATOR ASHFORD IS RESPONSIBLE FOR FAILING THE PEOPLE AND THAT'S WHY THERE'S ALL THIS CRIME. THAT'S THE HEAD OF THE POLICE UNION. I HAVE CONTEMPT FOR THEM. YOU KNOW WHAT I THOUGHT OF WHEN I SAW ALL THOSE POLICE IN NEW YORK PARADING DOWN THE STREET?--THE BIGGEST DOUGHNUT CONVENTION IN HISTORY. THANK YOU.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR GROENE, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED, AND IT WILL BE YOUR SECOND TIME.

SENATOR GROENE: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER. MANY OF YOU GOT THESE POSTCARDS IN THE MAIL THAT QUOTE SENATOR NORRIS: EVERY ACT OF THE LEGISLATURE AND EVERY ACT OF EACH INDIVIDUAL MUST BE TRANSACTED IN THE SPOTLIGHT OF PUBLICITY. I GOT THAT AND I THOUGHT ABOUT THEM AND SOME OF MY COLLEAGUES WERE TELLING ME, WELL, THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IS BEHIND THAT. THE TEA PARTY IS BEHIND THAT. I NEVER THOUGHT NOTHING ABOUT IT. I WENT HOME, VISITED WITH MY NUMBER ONE ADVISOR, MY WIFE, AND SHE SAID, MIKE, IF YOU WOULD HAVE NOT BEEN ELECTED TO THE LEGISLATURE WOULD YOU BEEN ONE OF THE FELLOWS SENDING THIS CARD? AND I SAID, YES, I WOULD. I DID NOT COME DOWN HERE TO CHANGE. I DID NOT COME DOWN HERE TO BE SOMEBODY I'M NOT. MY FELLOW COLLEAGUE, SENATOR McCOLLISTER, MENTIONED THE PLATTE INSTITUTE. I STARTED THE PLATTE INSTITUTE. I WAS ONE OF TWO FOUNDING MEMBERS, AND IT WAS ABOUT THIS--TRANSPARENCY. IT WAS ABOUT THE FACT THAT THOSE LITTLE MEN BEHIND THE EDITORIAL BOARDS THAT YOU READ FROM, FROM THE LOCAL PAPERS. TRANSPARENCY? I DON'T EVEN KNOW WHO THEY ARE. I DON'T QUOTE ANYBODY THAT AIN'T GOT THE GUTS TO STAND UP AND TELL ME WHO THEY ARE AND WHAT THEY STAND FOR. BECAUSE OF THOSE FOLKS AND ISSUES I WAS INVOLVED IN STATEWIDE, TWO SIDES OF THE STORY WAS NEVER TOLD. SO WE STARTED THE PLATTE INSTITUTE, AND NOW THE GOOD AND HONEST MEMBERS OF THE PRESS HAVE SOMEBODY ELSE TO GO TO, TO GET THE OTHER SIDE OF ISSUES AND STORIES. I WANT TO CLARIFY SOMETHING HERE FOR THE FUTURE. I TOOK NO MONEY FROM A LOBBYIST OR SPECIAL INTEREST WHEN I RAN FOR OFFICE. I GOT OUTSPENT \$200,000 TO \$35,000. I GOT ELECTED BECAUSE I'M TRANSPARENT, BECAUSE I SPEAK UP. NO MONEY. MY OPPONENT WAS A REPUBLICAN. THE REPUBLICAN PARTY HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH MY RACE. SECONDLY, THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IN MY COUNTY, UNLIKE SENATOR KRIST, WOULD CENSURE ME FOR TAKING THIS STAND BECAUSE THEY'RE MORE TO THE ROCKEFELLER REPUBLICAN SIDE AND I'M MORE TO THE WORKING MAN SIDE OF THE PARTY. BUT, ANYWAY, THOSE ARE A COUPLE OF COMMENTS I WANT TO CLARIFY IN THE FUTURE WHEN YOU THROW THE WORD "LOBBYIST"

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

AROUND. SENATOR COOK, I DON'T KNOW IF YOU WERE REFERRING TO ME WHEN I SAID I WOULD DEFEND ANYBODY'S RIGHT TO SPEAK. I VOTED AGAINST THAT AMENDMENT. SO I'M SURE IT WASN'T ME THAT YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT. ALSO, I KEEP HEARING ABOUT COLLEGIALLY. I LOOKED UP THE DEFINITION. THERE'S TWO SENSES OF THAT WORD. NUMBER ONE DEFINITION IS: CHARACTERIZED BY OR HAVING AUTHORITY VESTED EQUALLY AMONG COLLEAGUES. THAT IS TRUE IN THIS BODY. THE OTHER DEFINITION: OF OR RESEMBLING A TYPICAL COLLEGE OR COLLEGE STUDENTS. SECRECY, WHICH ONE OF THOSE TWO DEFINITIONS DO YOU THINK FITS? WHO WOULD USE SECRECY? THE COLLEGE STUDENT OR HONORABLE MEN AND WOMEN? THANK YOU.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR CRAWFORD, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR CRAWFORD: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER, AND GOOD AFTERNOON, COLLEAGUES. I STAND IN OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSAL TO ADOPT TO AMEND THAT'S ON THE FLOOR CURRENTLY. AND MANY OF MY COLLEAGUES HAVE ALREADY SPOKEN VERY ELOQUENTLY ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF PROTECTING THE NONPARTISAN NATURE OF THIS BODY AND HOW IMPORTANT OUR EXISTING PROCESS OF ELECTING CHAIRS IS FOR MAINTAINING THE NONPARTISANSHIP OF THIS BODY. AND I CONCUR WITH THOSE ARGUMENTS SO I'M NOT GOING TO REPEAT THEM. I'M GOING TO TRY TO ADD A COUPLE OTHER SUBSTANTIVE POINTS AND ALSO TALK ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF CONSIDERING PROCESS AS WELL AS SUBSTANCE WHEN WE'RE VOTING ON THESE KINDS OF ISSUES. SO ONE OF THE ARGUMENTS THAT HAS BEEN MADE IS THAT A SECRET BALLOT ENCOURAGES SECRET DEALS. ACTUALLY, THE OPPOSITE IS TRUE, IS THAT IF YOU HAVE A SECRET BALLOT NO ONE CAN ENFORCE ANY DEAL, SECRET OR NOT. SO THAT'S A VERY IMPORTANT FACT OF HOW INSTITUTIONS WORK. A SECRET BALLOT PREVENTS PEOPLE FROM CREATING DEALS AND ENFORCING DEALS, AND THAT'S AN IMPORTANT PART OF HOW IT WORKS. SECONDLY, WE LEARN A LOT WHEN WE GO TO NATIONAL CONFERENCES AND TALK TO PEOPLE FROM OTHER STATES ABOUT HOW THEIR STATE LEGISLATURES WORK. AND ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE OFTEN LEARN IS THAT CHAIRMANSHIPS IN STATES WHERE PARTIES ARE IN CHARGE, WHICH IS EVERY OTHER STATE BUT OURS, CHAIRMANSHIPS IN THOSE STATES IS VERY MUCH TIED OFTEN TO PEOPLE'S FUND-RAISING ABILITIES. AND WHEN PARTIES ARE ABLE TO DETERMINE WHO SITS IN A CHAIR, GUESS WHAT? ALL OF A SUDDEN THERE IS ANOTHER LEVER FOR PARTIES TO USE TO RAISE MONEY. AND I HAVE TALKED WITH COLLEAGUES, WHO TELL ME, IN OTHER STATES THERE IS A PRICE TO BEING A CHAIR. AND SO THAT INTRODUCES ANOTHER ELEMENT OF SPECIAL INTEREST POWER THAT WE WANT TO PROTECT OUR INSTITUTION FROM. WE ALREADY ARE OFTEN, YOU KNOW, TALKING TO PEOPLE AND RAISING MONEY FOR OUR

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

OWN RACES AND NEEDING TO BE VERY ETHICAL ABOUT HOW WE DO THAT, BUT IF YOU ADD...TAKE AWAY THE SECRET BALLOT, IT ADDS THAT INCENTIVE FOR PARTIES TO STEP UP AND REQUIRE THAT, IN ORDER FOR THEM TO GET BEHIND YOU GETTING IN THOSE CHAIRS, THAT IS YOU RAISE MONEY FOR THE PARTY AS WELL AS RAISING MONEY FOR YOURSELF, AND THAT ADDS EXTRA PRESSURE. AND WE CAN SEE WHAT HAPPENS, FOR EXAMPLE, IN CONGRESS WHERE PEOPLE ARE SPENDING FOUR TO SIX HOURS A DAY ON FUND-RAISING AND NOT SPENDING TIME ON THE IMPORTANT WORK OF LEGISLATION. AND ONE OF THE GREAT PRIVILEGES WE HAVE HERE IS THAT WE DON'T HAVE THAT PRESSURE AND WE ARE ABLE TO SPEND TIME HERE DOING THE IMPORTANT WORK OF THE PEOPLE OF NEBRASKA. SO IT IS MY CONTENTION THAT GETTING RID OF THE SECRET BALLOT NOT ONLY INTRODUCES PARTISAN PRESSURE BUT IT WOULD INCREASE THE SPECIAL INTEREST PRESSURE AND PRESSURE OF MONEY ON POLITICS, WHICH I BELIEVE WE WANT TO AVOID. AND, FINALLY, MANY OF OUR VOTES ON THIS FLOOR ARE ABOUT BOTH SUBSTANCE AND PROCESS, AND THAT'S THE CASE WITH THIS VOTE AS WELL. WE HAVE ASKED A GROUP OF OUR COLLEAGUES TO DELIBERATE OVER THE PROPOSED RULES, AND THEY HAVE DONE SO AND DONE AN ADMIRABLE JOB. AND THEY HAVE UNANIMOUSLY SAID THAT WE SHOULD NOT ADOPT THIS RULE, AND I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT FOR US TO RESPECT THAT WORK OF OUR COLLEAGUES. THIS IS NOT A CASE WHERE A CHAIR HAS REFUSED TO CONSIDER THE RULE OR WHERE THE COMMITTEE WAS VERY SPLIT OR WHERE THE COMMITTEE DOES NOT REFLECT THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE BODY WHERE THERE MIGHT BE SOME LEGITIMATE PURPOSE TO ASK US ON THE FLOOR TO RECONSIDER THEIR...

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE.

SENATOR CRAWFORD: THANK YOU...TO RECONSIDER THEIR DECISION. THIS COMMITTEE CONSIDERED THIS RULE THOROUGHLY, THIS COMMITTEE REFLECTS THIS BODY, AND THIS COMMITTEE UNANIMOUSLY SAID WE SHOULD NOT ADOPT THIS RULE. I RESPECT THEIR DECISION. I OPPOSE THIS AMENDMENT. THANK YOU.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR BRASCH, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR BRASCH: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER, AND GOOD AFTERNOON, COLLEAGUES. I'VE BEEN IN A REVENUE HEARING. I HAVE NOT HEARD ALL THE DIALOGUE. I DON'T WANT TO REPEAT WHAT I HAVEN'T HEARD, SO I APOLOGIZE IF YOU'VE HEARD IT. BUT I DID WANT TO STAND AND IN SUPPORT OF AMENDING RULE 1, SECTION 1, RULE 3, SECTION 8. THIS IS MY...STARTING MY FIFTH YEAR. I'VE JUST BEEN REELECTED. SINCE DAY ONE, YEAR ONE, I HAVE SEEN THE SECRET BALLOTS WORK. AFTERWARDS, THERE ARE PEOPLE

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

WHO HAVE COME AROUND AND THEY ARE WONDERING WHO DID NOT KEEP THEIR WORD. I HAD THE VOTES. THEY TOLD ME THEY WERE GOING TO SUPPORT ME, AND THEN AT THE END OF THE VOTE IT NEVER HAPPENED. IT NEVER CAME ABOUT. THERE ARE SEVERAL INDIVIDUALS THAT...WHO RAN FOR SOMETHING THAT SAID, YOU KNOW, I JUST CAN'T TRUST X, Y, AND Z. I THINK IT BUILDS TRUST WHEN YOU PUT YOUR VOTES OPEN IN THE PUBLIC. WE VOTE ON A LOT OF DIFFERENT THINGS WITH A LOT OF VARYING VIEWS, WHETHER IT'S THE DEATH PENALTY, MEDICAID EXPANSION, EDUCATION. AND WE SEE OUR VOTES AND WE DO NOT HARBOR ILL FEELINGS OR ANIMOSITY BECAUSE WE DON'T THINK ALIKE. EACH OF US ARE REPRESENTATIVES. WE ARE SENT HERE TO REPRESENT OUR CONSTITUENTS AND THEY, TOO, HAVE VARYING VIEWS. EVERY YEAR I HAVE HELD A TOWN HALL MEETING BEFORE SESSION, DURING SESSION, AND AFTER SESSION. I HAVE POSTED ON-LINE SURVEYS. WE WORK TO FIND OUT WHAT OUR CONSTITUENTS WOULD LIKE US TO BRING FORWARD. WE CANNOT DELIVER EVERYTHING, BUT WE DO OUR BEST. I HAVE HEARD FROM SEVERAL CONSTITUENTS THAT THEY ARE INTERESTED IN TRANSPARENCY IN GOVERNMENT, TRANSPARENCY IN OUR INSTITUTION. REGARDLESS OF WHAT SENATOR CRAWFORD, WHAT HER BELIEFS ARE, I STILL RESPECT HER FOR IT. AND WHEN THIS DEBATE HAS ENDED, SHE WILL STILL BE A GOOD COLLEAGUE, WELL RESPECTED, AND I WILL NOT WORRY THAT HER AND I DO NOT ALIGN IDENTICALLY, BECAUSE THERE ARE TIMES WHEN WE DO ALIGN. AND THE IDEOLOGIES THAT WE SHARE, WHETHER IT'S REPUBLICAN, DEMOCRATIC, INDEPENDENT, LIBERTARIAN, THOSE DEFINE OUR VIEWS OF THE GOVERNMENT THAT WE BELIEVE WOULD BEST SERVE ALL PEOPLE. BUT AT THE END OF THE DAY, WE DO SERVE ALL PEOPLE, AND WE ARE ELECTED AT THE PLEASURE OF THE PEOPLE. TERM LIMITS IS AT THE VOTING POLL EVERY FOUR YEARS. WE ALSO HAVE A TWO-YEAR TERM HERE. I BELIEVE THAT BECAUSE IT'S BEEN INTRODUCED EVERY YEAR, PERHAPS WE SHOULD CONSIDER THIS. THE TOPIC DOES NOT GO AWAY. I WOULD LIKE TO THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION AND THANK SENATOR KINTNER FOR INTRODUCING THIS AND SENATOR SCHNOOR AND EBKE AS COSIGNERS. THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER, AND THANK YOU, COLLEAGUES.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SEEING NO OTHER LIGHTS IN THE QUEUE, SENATOR KINTNER, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE ON THE KINTNER AMENDMENT. I'M SORRY, SENATOR SCHEER'S LIGHT JUST CAME ON. I'M SORRY. RECOGNIZE SENATOR SCHEER.

SENATOR SCHEER: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER. I, TOO, WAS DOWNSTAIRS IN A MEETING AND SO I AM AT A LOSS TO WHAT HAS BEEN SAID. I DON'T HAVE A LOT OF SKIN IN THIS GAME. I COULD PROBABLY LIVE WITH EITHER WAY. BUT I DO KNOW THAT, IN TALKING TO PEOPLE THAT HAVE RAN FOR BOTH SPEAKER

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

AND COMMITTEE POSITIONS, THERE IS A CONCERN THAT PEOPLE WILL DO WHAT THEY SAY THEY'RE GOING TO DO. I KNOW I REMEMBER TALKING SEVERAL YEARS AGO TO SENATOR FLOOD, MY PREDECESSOR. HE TOLD ME THE FIRST TIME HE SPOKE...OR THAT HE RAN FOR SPEAKER, I BELIEVE HE RAN AGAINST SENATOR SCHIMEK. AND HE WAS WALKING UP ON THE FIRST DAY OF THE SESSION AND TALKING TO A GENTLEMAN, A FELLOW SENATOR, AND HE SAID, WELL, DO YOU HAVE VOTES? HE SAYS, YEAH, I THINK I SHOULD BE PRETTY GOOD, I'VE GOT 34. BUT HE SAID, JUST COINCIDENTLY I WAS WALKING PAST SENATOR SCHIMEK AT THE EXACT SAME TIME AND SO I DID MY DUTIFUL BEST AND EAVESDROPPED ON HER CONVERSATION AND OVERHEARD HER SAY, YEAH, YOU KNOW, THINGS ARE GOOD, I'VE GOT 31 VOTES. HE SAID, NOW EITHER WE HAVE A LOT MORE MEMBERS THAN I THOUGHT OR A LOT OF PEOPLE ARE GOING TO GET TO VOTE TWICE. THE ONLY REASON THAT I FEEL THAT THIS COULD BE A POSITIVE THING FOR THE FLOOR IS WE'RE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR OUR VOTES ALL THE TIME. OUR BILLS ARE PERSONAL TO US FOR THE MOST CASE. THEY ARE. WE DO TAKE OWNERSHIP OF THEM. AND WHEN I ASK SOMEBODY TO SUPPORT A BILL THEY KNOW THEY EITHER HAVE TO SAY YES, NO, OR MAYBE. BUT THEY CAN'T TELL ME YES AND THEN VOTE NO, BECAUSE I'LL FIND OUT. WE'RE HELD RESPONSIBLE TO OURSELVES AS A BODY. BUT YET WHEN WE ARE VOTING FOR LEADERSHIP POSITIONS, WE DON'T HOLD OURSELVES RESPONSIBLE TO OURSELVES. SENATOR WILLIAMS CAN RUN FOR A CHAIR AND SENATOR MORFELD, AND I CAN EASILY TELL THEM BOTH THAT I'LL SUPPORT YOU. NEITHER ONE OF THEM WILL NEVER KNOW WHO I SUPPORT. THAT MIGHT BE OKAY. BUT ON THE SAME HAND WE'RE ALL ADULTS HERE. WE ARE ELECTED AND WE SHOULD BE ABLE TO STAND BY THE POSITIONS AND THE PEOPLE THAT WE SUPPORT. THIS INSTITUTION IS NOT GOING TO DIE IF WE DO ADOPT IT OR IF WE DON'T. BUT I DO THINK TO A CERTAIN EXTENT THAT THIS AMENDMENT DOES HAVE SOME LEGITIMACY. IT BRINGS THE SAME RULES THAT WE DEAL WITH THE REST OF THE SESSION TO THE FIRST DAY OF THE SESSION. IT COULD BE GOOD, COULD BE BAD. I MISSED MOST OF THE CONVERSATION SO I'M NOT TRYING TO IMPLY THAT ANYONE THAT SPOKE EITHER DIRECTION HAS SAID ANYTHING GOOD OR BAD. I JUST THINK THAT THIS IS SOMETHING THAT, IF NOTHING ELSE, HAS DESERVED THE CONVERSATION THAT IT'S HAD. THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR PANSING BROOKS, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR PANSING BROOKS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. AS I SIT HERE LISTENING TO ALL OF THIS TODAY, ALL I CAN DO IS GO BACK TO THIS ARTICLE THAT SENATOR KRIST SENT OUT. AND WHAT WE'RE REALLY TALKING ABOUT ARE NOT THE DELICATE FEELINGS OF OUR COLLEAGUES AND WHETHER OR NOT WE'RE MANEUVERING BETWEEN VOTE TO VOTE AND TRYING TO GARNER

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

AS MANY OF THE PEOPLE AS WE CAN FOR WHATEVER OFFICE WE HOPE TO HOLD. WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT IS THE MARCHING ORDERS OF OUR PARTIES. AND I STAND IN COMPLETE...I AM COMPLETELY AGAINST THIS AMENDMENT AND THIS PROPOSAL. I THINK THAT WE HAVE TO BE INDEPENDENT. A PROCEDURAL ISSUE SUCH AS THIS IS MERELY A PROCEDURAL ISSUE. I SPOKE TO THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE, LIKE MANY OF YOU DID, GOING DOOR TO DOOR. NOT ONCE DID I HAVE SOMEBODY SAY TO ME, WE SHOULD MAKE THE VOTING ON THE COMMITTEE CHAIRS AND THE SPEAKER PUBLIC. AND TO SAY THAT WE WON'T HOLD THAT AGAINST OUR COMRADES AND OUR COLLEAGUES, ONE OF MY CLASSMATES MENTIONED FOUR DIFFERENT TIMES THAT HE HAS KEPT A LIST OF THE PEOPLE THAT DID NOT SUPPORT HIM, THE STATE SENATORS WHO DID NOT SUPPORT HIM, AND THAT HE'S GOING TO REMEMBER THAT. AGAIN, I DON'T THINK THAT'S A GREAT DECISION AND IT DOESN'T REALLY HAVE TO DO WITH THIS. WHAT THIS HAS TO DO WITH IS HAVING THE PARTIES WHO HELPED US GET HERE DETERMINE THAT WE'RE NOT WORTHY TO HOLD THIS SEAT BECAUSE OF A SPECIFIC VOTE. AND WE HAVE THIS ARTICLE IN FRONT OF US RIGHT NOW ABOUT SENATOR KRIST BEING CENSURED. AND I PRESUME THAT THIS MEANS THAT HE WILL NOT GET SUPPORT FROM HIS PARTY, AND I THINK THAT'S UNREASONABLE. AND SO THAT'S ALL I HAVE TO SAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I YIELD MY TIME.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR SCHUMACHER.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE BODY. I, TOO, WAS AT A REVENUE COMMITTEE MEETING AND MAYBE MISSED SOME OF THE SALIENT ARGUMENTS HERE. I RISE IN OPPOSITION TO THIS PARTICULAR PROPOSAL. I THINK IF THE PUBLIC OUT THERE IS LOOKING AT US, THEY MUST BE WONDERING WHAT'S ALL THIS BUSINESS ABOUT CHAIRS, WHAT TREMENDOUS POWER MUST THESE CHAIRS HAVE, WHEN THOSE OF US THAT HAVE BEEN HERE A LITTLE WHILE KNOW THAT THE CHAIR IS A PERSON WHO VOLUNTEERS TO SERVE TO ADMINISTER A COMMITTEE. THERE'S NO MAGIC POWER IN THE CHAIR. THE POWER LIES IN THE MEMBERS AND PERSONALITIES OF THE COMMITTEE WHO CAN BRING SOMETHING TO THE FLOOR WITH FIVE VOTES, CAUSE A HEARING TO BE HELD, WHO CAN RISE AGAINST THE COMMITTEE ON THE FLOOR OF THE LEGISLATURE AND DEFEAT A BILL THAT IS ENDORSED, MAYBE EVEN SPONSORED BY THE CHAIR. THE CHAIR IS A POSITION OF SERVICE TO THE COMMITTEE. IT IS NOT A POSITION OF GREAT POWER. NOW, MAYBE IN THE PAST WE HAD CHAIRS WHO WERE AROUND FOR YEARS AND YEARS AND YEARS AND GOING TO BE AROUND FOR YEARS AND YEARS AND YEARS. THEY CARRIED A BIG STICK AND RULED WITH AN IRON FIST. I DON'T KNOW. I WASN'T HERE THEN. BUT TODAY IT IS THE COMMITTEES, IT IS EACH AND EVERY ONE OF US, AS GEORGE NORRIS

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

FORESAW, WHO ARE EQUAL IN POWER, WHO ARE EQUAL IN RESPONSIBILITY, WHO CAN BRING FORTH AS MANY BILLS AS WE CAN DREAM UP OR FEEL THAT ARE WORTHY. WHAT THIS KIND OF EFFORT DOES, AND I MAY BE WRONG, BUT I THINK THE EFFORT AND THE WHOLE HOOP-DE-LA ABOUT THIS IS COMING FROM WITHOUT THIS BODY AND COMING FROM A COUPLE OF POLITICAL CLUBS, POLITICAL CLUBS WHO ARE ELECTED AT COUNTY CONVENTIONS THAT CANNOT EVEN GET 1 PERCENT OF THE REGISTERED VOTERS TO ATTEND. THEY HAVE NO LEGITIMACY TO SPEAK FOR "THE" DEMOCRATS OR "THE" REPUBLICANS. AND YET IF WE YIELD THIS KIND OF PRESSURE HERE OR ON ANY MAGICAL ISSUE THAT THEY PULL OUT OF THEIR HAT IF THEY KNOW THEY CAN DRAW BLOOD, THEN WE FOREVER WILL BE SEEING THE KIND OF PRESSURE, THE KIND OF "NASTY GRAMS" SENT OUT, THE KIND OF THREATS ABOUT CENSURE THAT WE SEE OVER THIS ISSUE WHICH WE ALL, IN OUR HEARTS, KNOW IS A VERY MINOR ISSUE. THIS IS THIS WAY FOR A REASON--IT HAS WORKED. I HAVE NEVER, BEFORE THIS LITTLE HOOP-DE-LA STARTED, HAD ANYBODY COME UP TO ME AND SAY, YOU KNOW, I THINK SO-AND-SO SHOULD BE CHAIR; BOY, THIS IS A ROTTEN CHAIR. BECAUSE THE PEOPLE ARE AHEAD OF US. THEY UNDERSTAND PERSPECTIVE. AND MY GREAT CONCERN HERE, LET'S NOT GET SUCKED INTO THE SITUATION WHERE WE HAVE GOT TO KOWTOW TO A SMALL CLIQUE OF PARTY CHIEFTAINS ON EITHER SIDE OF THE AISLE WHO HAVE NOT BEEN ELECTED BY ANYBODY BUT A COUNTY CONVENTION AT WHICH VIRTUALLY NOBODY ATTENDED. AND THAT IS THE DETERIORATED SITUATION OF OUR PARTIES. THAT'S WHY OUR PARTIES ARE UNABLE TO DELIVER EFFECTIVE IDEAS OR LEADERSHIP. AND THANK THE GOOD LORD THAT THIS BODY IS NOT SHACKLED TO THOSE PARTIES. LET'S PRESERVE THAT. IT IS ONE OF THE PRECIOUS, PRECIOUS THINGS THAT WE HAVE IN NEBRASKA THAT HAS BEEN UNABLE TO BE DUPLICATED ELSEWHERE, AND NOT ONE OF US...

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE, SENATOR.

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: ...WOULD TRADE OUR SITUATION AND OUR ABILITY TO BE INDEPENDENT AND VOTE OUR CONSCIENCE AND VOTE WHAT THE PEOPLE IN OUR DISTRICT WANT WITHOUT HAVING TO KOWTOW TO A GROUP OF PARTY CHIEFTAINS AND THE THREATS OF CENSURE AND THE THREATS OF WITHDRAWAL OF FUNDING. WE DON'T NEED THAT HERE. I ENCOURAGE YOU TO VOTE AGAINST THIS IDEA. THANK YOU.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR MURANTE, DO YOU NOT WISH TO...YOU WITHDRAW. SEEING NO ONE ELSE IN THE QUEUE, SENATOR KINTNER, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE ON YOUR AMENDMENT TO THE PERMANENT RULES.

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

SENATOR KINTNER: WELL, THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I CAN'T SAY THAT I'M AS FIRED UP AS SENATOR SCHUMACHER, BUT I AM VERY PASSIONATE ABOUT THIS. I FEEL, FOR EVERY BONE IN MY BODY, THAT WE'RE DOING THE RIGHT THING HERE HAVING THIS VOTE. WE'RE DOING THE RIGHT THING HAVING THIS DISCUSSION. IF NOTHING ELSE, THE STATE IS BETTER OFF BECAUSE WE SHED A LITTLE LIGHT ON HOW WE DO THINGS HERE. I'VE HEARD SOME OF MY COLLEAGUES SAY, WELL, GOSH, NOBODY BROUGHT THIS UP WHEN I WAS CAMPAIGNING. WELL, I GOT TO TELL YOU SOMETHING. I THINK PEOPLE JUST ASSUME THAT WE DO THINGS IN THE DAYLIGHT. THAT'S HOW WE DO THINGS IN THIS BODY. YOU KNOW, THE PEOPLE ARE THE SECOND HOUSE. THEY JUST EXPECT US TO DO THIS. WHEN YOU TELL THEM, HEY, DO YOU KNOW WE DO THESE SECRET BALLOTS, DO YOU THINK WE SHOULD DO IT, THEY'RE LIKE, WHAT? SECRET BALLOTS? NO. NO. THEY DON'T LIKE THIS STUFF. THEY DON'T LIKE THIS STUFF AT ALL. YOU KNOW, ONE OF MY COLLEAGUES QUOTED THE OMAHA WORLD-HERALD, SURELY AN AUTHORITY ON GOOD GOVERNMENT, I MIGHT ADD. THEY THINK WE SHOULD SUPPORT PEOPLE ON THE BASIS OF EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE. I GUESS I ACTUALLY AGREE WITH THE WORLD-HERALD FOR A CHANGE. THEY'RE RIGHT! I DON'T SEE HOW LETTING PEOPLE SEE HOW WE VOTE WOULD THWART THAT. I, FOR THE LIFE OF ME, CAN'T FIGURE OUT IF WE REVEAL WHO YOU VOTED FOR, HOW DOES THAT NOT...HOW DOES THAT STOP ME FROM VOTING FOR THE MOST QUALIFIED PERSON WITH THE RIGHT ABILITY AND THE RIGHT EXPERTISE? I DON'T GET THE CONNECTION THERE. MATTER OF FACT, THERE IS NO CONNECTION THERE. SO I THINK WHEN VOTERS KNOW THAT THEY SMELL A RAT, AND THEY DON'T LIKE IT TOO MUCH. YOU KNOW, ONE OF MY COLLEAGUES SAID, HOW I VOTE IS NONE OF YOUR BUSINESS. WOW! GO TELL THAT TO YOUR CONSTITUENTS. GO TELL THEM IT'S NONE OF YOUR BUSINESS. KNOCK ON THEIR DOOR AND SAY, HOW I VOTE IS NONE OF YOUR BUSINESS, AND SEE HOW THAT GOES OVER. IT WON'T. WE CANNOT HAVE THE APPEARANCE OF ARROGANCE. WE CANNOT APPEAR TO BE THAT ARROGANT. WE NEED TO DO EVERYTHING IN THE OPEN. WE NEED TO REACH OUT. WE NEED TO ENGAGE PEOPLE. WE NEED TO ENCOURAGE THEM TO BE INVOLVED IN THIS PROCESS AND WE NEED TO ENCOURAGE THEM TO HOLD US ACCOUNTABLE FOR OUR VOTES. I HAD ANOTHER SENATOR SAY TODAY THAT THIS IS A BAD IDEA, RIGHT AFTER CHAMPIONING LAST YEAR TRANSPARENCY, A GREAT BILL LAST YEAR. I'D LOVE TO SUPPORT IT. BUT IT'S ONLY GOOD IF IT'S FOR THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH. IT'S NOT GOOD IF IT'S FOR US. I DON'T UNDERSTAND THAT. TRANSPARENCY IS EITHER GOOD FOR EVERYONE OR IT'S GOOD FOR NO ONE. I JUST DON'T THINK THAT'S RIGHT. I THINK...WE'RE GOING TO VOTE ON THIS. WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A RECORD VOTE. WE'RE GOING TO ROLL CALL VOTE THIS. YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE A CHANCE TO STATE WHERE YOU STAND AND IT'S BETWEEN YOU AND YOUR CONSTITUENTS HOW YOU VOTE. BUT WE'RE GOING TO GIVE THEM THE OPPORTUNITY TO SEE WHERE WE ALL

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

STAND ON THIS. AND I HOPE YOU DO THE RIGHT THING, THE THING THAT YOU FEEL STRONGLY ABOUT. AND I THINK THAT WE'LL BE BETTER OFF FOR HAVING THIS DISCUSSION AND HAVING THIS VOTE. AND WITH THAT, MR. PRESIDENT, I WOULD LIKE A CALL OF THE HOUSE.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THERE HAS BEEN A REQUEST OF THE CALL OF THE HOUSE. THIS IS A VOTE, VOTE YES FOR A CALL OF THE HOUSE, NO FOR NOT FOR A CALL OF THE HOUSE. ALL PRESENT, I BELIEVE YOU ASKED FOR A ROLL CALL. A RECORDED ROLL CALL VOTE.

CLERK: 45 AYES, 0 NAYS, MR. PRESIDENT, TO PLACE THE HOUSE UNDER CALL.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THE HOUSE IS UNDER CALL. WILL ALL THE UNAUTHORIZED PEOPLE PLEASE LEAVE THE FLOOR. MEMBERS, PLEASE CHECK IN. MR. CLERK, THERE WILL BE A ROLL CALL VOTE IN REVERSE ORDER. SENATOR KRIST, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED.

SENATOR KRIST: I'M CENSURED ALREADY. DID WE MAKE SURE THAT EVERYONE WAS IN THEIR SEATS? HAVE WE FINISHED THE CALL?

CLERK: ALL 45 MEMBERS CHECKED IN WHEN THEY VOTED ON THE CALL, SENATOR.

SENATOR KRIST: OKAY. I MISSED THAT.

CLERK: SO ALL MEMBERS THAT WEREN'T EXCUSED ARE PRESENT.

SENATOR KRIST: I MISSED THAT FROM THE CHAIR. THANK YOU.

CLERK: OKAY. (ROLL CALL VOTE TAKEN, LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGE 192.) 12 AYES, 33 NAYS, MR. PRESIDENT, ON THE PROPOSED RULES CHANGE.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THE GROENE AMENDMENT FAILS. DISCUSSION ON THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE PERMANENT RULES WILL NOW CONTINUE. SEEING NONE, SENATOR GARRETT, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE ON THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE PERMANENT RULES. SENATOR CHAMBERS, I'M SORRY I MISSED YOU. SENATOR CHAMBERS.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THAT'S ALL RIGHT. MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, MR. CHAIRMAN, I'M GOING TO VOTE NO ON THESE RULES AS I ALWAYS DO, NOT THAT I'M A LAWLESS PERSON, BUT I WANT TO BE AN EXAMPLE. I AM NOT GOING TO VOTE IN FAVOR OF THE RULES THAT THE MAJORITY OF YOU WILL AND SHOULD VOTE FOR. BUT HAVING VOTED AGAINST THESE RULES, I

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

INTEND TO COMPLY WITH THEM SCRUPULOUSLY BECAUSE I ALWAYS TELL YOUNG PEOPLE WHEN I ADDRESS THEM THAT WHEN YOU'RE IN A GAME, THE FIRST THING YOU MUST DO IS LEARN THE RULES THAT GOVERN THE GAME. FOR EXAMPLE, IF YOU SIT DOWN AT A CARD TABLE AND YOU'RE LOOKING FOR THE PIGEON AND YOU DON'T SEE THE PIGEON, YOU LEAVE BECAUSE YOU ARE THE PIGEON. BUT IN ANY CASE, YOU LEARN WHAT THE RULES ARE, WHICH I WILL DO. OUR RULE BOOK IS SLIM. IT HAS A LOT OF SECTIONS BUT NOT A LOT OF MATERIAL. EVERYBODY CAN MASTER ALL OF THE RULES IN THAT BOOK. SO NOBODY SHOULD BE AT A DISADVANTAGE. BUT IN THE SAME WAY THAT EVERYBODY HAS TWO LEGS, NOT EVERYBODY CAN RUN AS FAST AS EVERYBODY ELSE. EVERYBODY HAS GOT TWO FISTS UNLESS THEY HAD AN ACCIDENT, BUT NOT EVERYBODY CAN BE THE HEAVYWEIGHT CHAMPION OF THE WORLD. SO YOU DO THE BEST YOU CAN WITH WHAT YOU HAVE TO WORK WITH. EVERYBODY IN HERE HAS A BRAIN. EVERYBODY HERE HAS A BRAIN THAT IS FUNCTIONING AND OPERATIONAL, DESPITE WHAT I MIGHT HAVE SAID BEFORE, AND THE REASON I SAY THAT IS BECAUSE YOU KNOW THAT WHEN YOU WANT TO LEAVE THIS CHAMBER YOU GO OUT THE DOOR AND DON'T TRY TO WALK THROUGH THE STONE WALL. UP TO NOW THAT HAS BEEN THE CASE, BUT YOU NEVER KNOW WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN. SO I BELIEVE AND ACCEPT IT AS A PRINCIPLE ACCORDING TO WHICH I MUST WORK THAT EVERY MAN AND WOMAN'S HAND IS RAISED AGAINST ME; THEREFORE, MY HAND MUST BE RAISED AGAINST EVERYBODY. BUT WE DON'T USE WEAPONS HERE OTHER THAN OUR WIT, OUR BRAINS, WORDS, AND THE RULES. WE ARE LIKE A DEBATING SOCIETY, BUT WITH A DIFFERENCE. WE DON'T HAVE TO BE LIMITED TO EXPRESSING FINE THOUGHTS. WE HAVE THE POWER TO DO SOMETHING TO ACTUALIZE THOSE THOUGHTS. WE CAN MAKE SURE THAT THOSE WHO ARE ILL WILL HAVE ACCESS TO MEDICAL CARE, THOSE WHO ARE HOMELESS CAN BE PROVIDED WITH SHELTER, THOSE WHO ARE UNJUSTLY INCARCERATED WILL HAVE AN AVENUE THROUGH WHICH AND BY WHICH TO PROCURE THEIR FREEDOM. THE VOICELESS WILL HAVE A SPOKESPERSON. THE FRIENDLESS WILL HAVE A FRIEND. THE DOWNTRODDEN WILL HAVE ONE WHO WILL UPLIFT. AND WE CAN ALL DO THOSE THINGS. BUT OTHER THAN WHEN WE'RE IN THE MOOD TO MAKE A LOT OF FINE-SOUNDING PRONOUNCEMENTS, WE'RE NOT GOING TO DO IT. THOSE PRAYERS THAT ARE UTTERED EVERY MORNING IN HERE WILL GO NO HIGHER THAN THIS CEILING, AND YOU KNOW IT. THE PREACHER COULD STAND UP THERE AND SAY, LORD, LET THESE POWERFUL MEN AND WOMEN...

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...OF GOODWILL TAKE CARE OF THE WIDOWS AND THE ORPHANS. THEN A BILL COMES UP AFFECTING THE WELFARE OF WIDOWS AND ORPHANS, AND THE GOVERNOR AND THAT PARTY HAS SAID NO. SO THE

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

LEGISLATURE, BY A MAJORITY, VOTES NO. THERE ARE MANY POOR PEOPLE IN THIS WORLD. JESUS SAID, THE POOR YOU HAVE WITH YOU ALWAYS. HE DIDN'T SAY THE RICH YOU HAVE WITH YOU ALWAYS BECAUSE YOU'LL KNOW THAT BECAUSE THEY'RE GOING TO BE WALKING ON YOU. THE POOR, WHO ARE CONFRONTED WITH PROBLEMS AT EVERY TURN IN THE ROAD, AT EVERY CORNER, HAVE NO WAY TO MEET THE PROBLEMS THAT THEY OUGHT NOT HAVE TO FACE IN A COUNTRY AS RICH AS THIS ONE. BUT THE WEALTH IS NOT FAIRLY DISTRIBUTED. AND I'M APPRECIATIVE OF THE FACT...

SPEAKER HADLEY: TIME, SENATOR CHAMBERS.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THE CALL IS RAISED. AND, SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE NEXT IN THE QUEUE.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. I'M APPRECIATIVE OF THE FACT THAT A MAN WHO TOOK HIS NAME AFTER FRANCIS OF ASSISI, WHO LOVED ANIMALS, WHO SAID THAT THE ASS IS HIS BROTHER, WHO PREACHED TO ANIMALS, WHO MINISTERED TO ANIMALS, AND WORSHIPED THAT PERSON WHO SAID, A DAY WILL COME WHEN THE LION WILL LIE DOWN WITH THE LAMB. AND THAT CERTAINLY IS NOT GOING TO HAPPEN HERE, IS IT, BECAUSE THE LAMB IS THE FOOD OF THE LION? BUT THERE ARE LIONS AND THERE ARE LIONS. THERE ARE FOUR-FOOTED BEASTS WHO ACT IN ACCORD WITH THEIR NATURE AND ARE PREDICTABLE. THERE ARE THE TWO-LEGGED VARIETY WHO HIDE IN DARK PLACES, BEHIND TREES AND JUMP OUT TO AMBUSH THE UNWARY, THE UNSUSPECTING, THE VULNERABLE AND TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THEM AND WILL SAY WE'RE GOING TO WORK ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE BUT WE MEAN A CERTAIN PERCENTAGE OF THE PEOPLE. WE'RE GOING TO BE TALKING ABOUT...SOME PEOPLE ARE GOING TO BE TALKING ABOUT INCOME TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHY. HOW MUCH INCOME TAX IS BEING PAID BY THE MAJORITY OF THE PEOPLE BASED ON WHAT ALL THESE POLITICIANS TELL US? YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT CUTTING THE TAXES PAID ON LAND. NOBODY TOLD PEOPLE TO GO OUT AND GET ALL THAT LAND. BUT BECAUSE THAT IS THE CLARION CALL, EVERYBODY HAS HEARD IT AND MANY PEOPLE HAVE TAKEN IT UP, PROPERTY TAX RELIEF. THAT'S NOT WHAT I'M GOING TO BE WORKING ON. BUT IF A VOTE IS TAKEN AND IT'S SUCCESSFUL, I HAVE TO ACQUIESCE TO THAT VOTE AND I CANNOT OVERTURN IT. THAT IS WHAT A MAJORITY OF MISGUIDED PEOPLE DECIDED TO DO. AND BEFORE YOU ALL START GETTING UPSET WITH ME, I'M GOING TO TELL YOU TO DRAW PICTURES IN YOUR MIND OF THOSE RICH PEOPLE YOU'RE GOING TO BE SERVING. AND NOT ONE OF YOU WILL BE AT ONE OF THEIR SOCIAL EVENTS BECAUSE YOU'RE NOT WORTH IT, YOU'RE NOT GOOD ENOUGH, YOU'RE TOO LOW. YOU WOULD

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

ENCUMBER WHAT THEY'RE DOING. YOU WILL NEVER BE INVITED. THE ONLY TIME THEY CHEESE UP TO YOU IS WHEN THEY WANT TO PAT YOU ON THE HEAD AND TELL YOU HOW TO VOTE, TO GIVE YOU SOMETHING. BUT DON'T YOU DARKEN THEIR DOOR BECAUSE YOU ARE UNFIT. AND I'D LIKE ONE OF YOU ON THIS FLOOR TO STAND UP AND SUCCESSFULLY CHALLENGE WHAT I'M SAYING. I KNOW THE NAMES OF MOST OF THE RICH PEOPLE IN OMAHA THAT HAVE BEEN PUBLICIZED AND IN THE STATE, AND YOU ALL ARE NOT ON ANY OF THEIR GUEST LISTS. BUT IF THEY WANT A CERTAIN THING DONE, THEY'LL SEND SOMEBODY DOWN HERE--SOOEY, SOOEY--WHO KNOWS HOW TO CALL YOU TO THE TROUGH AND TAKE YOU IN ONE OF THESE ROOMS AND GIVE YOU SOME FAST FOOD, SOME SODA POP, SOME SANDWICHES, BUY YOU WITH A MEATLOAF SANDWICH AND A CHICKEN DINNER. AND YOU FEEL LIKE YOU'RE ONE OF THEM AND YOU THINK THEY REGARD YOU AS ONE OF THEM. HOW FOOLISH CAN IT BE? WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THOSE 39,000 PEOPLE THAT WE REPRESENT, EACH ONE OF US, FITS INTO THE CATEGORY OF THOSE THAT I'M TALKING ABOUT WHO ARE SO WEALTHY THEY HATE TO EVEN LOOK AT YOU? YET THOSE ARE THE ONES THIS LEGISLATURE IS GOING TO KOWTOW TO THIS SESSION. I CAN UNDERSTAND THE GOVERNOR DOING IT. HIS DADDY IS RICH. HE IS GOING TO FOLLOW WHAT HIS DADDY WANTS HIM TO DO.

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THAT'S WHAT HE WAS RAISED ON; NOT YOU. BUT YOU'RE GOING TO DO THE BIDDING OF THOSE PEOPLE AND I'M GOING TO REMIND YOU OF IT. OSCAR WILDE WAS ONE OF MY FAVORITE WRITERS. AND ONE OF THESE DAYS, I AM GOING TO TELL YOU ALL OF THE NAMES THAT COMPRISE HIS NAME. HE HAD MORE THAN JUST OSCAR AS HIS NAME. BUT, AT ANY RATE, HE SAID WORDS TO THE EFFECT, WHEN HE WAS TALKING ABOUT HOW POOR PEOPLE ARE DUPED INTO CARRYING...HE DIDN'T SAY CARRYING THE BALL BUT DOING THE WILL OF THE WEALTHY AND SUPPORTING THEM. HE SAID, IF THEY WERE GOING TO BENEFIT FROM THIS LARGESS, I COULD UNDERSTAND THEM DOING IT. BUT IN SO MANY WORDS, THEIR CHILDREN ARE SHOELESS, THEY ARE IN RAGS. THEY, THEMSELVES, ARE HUNGRY.

SPEAKER HADLEY: TIME, SENATOR. SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED AND THIS IS YOUR THIRD TIME.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THEY ARE HUNGRY. AND NEVERTHELESS, THEY ARE THE ONES WHO SPEAK THE LOUDEST IN BEHALF OF THE WEALTHY. PEOPLE ARE MISEDUCATED IN THIS SOCIETY. THE PREACHERS ARE AT THE BEHEST OF THE RICH PEOPLE. HUGE CATHEDRALS...I WON'T TELL YOU THE NAME OF THIS PARTICULAR SAINT. BY THE WAY, I'M NOT RELIGIOUS, NOT A CATHOLIC, NOT A PROTESTANT. AND IF I WERE ONE OF THESE THAT THEY CALL A

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

PROTESTANT, I WOULD NOT DEFINE MYSELF IN COUNTER DISTINCTION TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. AND ANYBODY NOT A CATHOLIC, WHATEVER ELSE YOU ARE, YOU'RE A PROTESTANT. WHY, THE RIFLE ASSOCIATION...THE AMERICAN RIFLE...THE U.S....THE AMERICAN RIFLE ASSOCIATION OUGHT TO START A CHURCH. AND THEY OUGHT TO CALL THEMSELVES THE "E-PISTOL-PALIANS" BECAUSE ALL OF THEM GOT PISTOLS. AND YOU KNOW WHAT? CONGRESSMEN ARE BECOMING A LITTLE ANXIOUS NOW BECAUSE A GUY WENT OUT AND PURCHASED SOME OF THOSE AUTOMATIC AND SEMIAUTOMATIC WEAPONS THAT CONGRESSMEN ARE SO ANXIOUS TO PROTECT. AND HE GOT THEM SO HE COULD GO TO WASHINGTON AND KILL UP SOME CONGRESSMEN. AND THE FBI CAUGHT HIM. BUT SOME CONGRESSMEN ARE STARTING TO HAVE SECOND THOUGHTS NOW ABOUT HOW EASY IT IS TO PROCURE GUNS BECAUSE THEY MIGHT BECOME THE TARGETS. BUT AT ANY RATE, THE POINT I'M TRYING TO GET TO IS THIS: WITH ALL THAT I'VE SAID ABOUT THE DIRECTION THAT I KNOW THIS LEGISLATURE IS GOING TO GO--THE HYPOCRITICAL PRAYERS, THE FLAG SALUTE ABOUT ONE NATION, INDIVISIBLE, AND EVEN THOSE IN CONGRESS AND EVERYWHERE ELSE TELL YOU THIS COUNTRY IS MORE DIVIDED NOW THAN IT HAS EVER BEEN. SO YOU MOUTH A LIE EVERY TIME YOU MAKE THAT PLEDGE. IT'S NOT TRUE. AND THERE IS NOT LIBERTY AND JUSTICE FOR EVERYBODY. THAT IS A LIE. SO YOU STAND UP HERE AND MOUTH A LIE EVERY DAY. YOU HAVE A PREACHER WHO SAYS WORDS THAT HAVE NO MEANING. AND YOU CAN SHOW THEY HAVE MEANING BY DOING WHAT THOSE WORDS SAY THAT YOU OUGHT TO DO. AND WHAT DO THEY SAY? THAT WHEN THE QUESTION IS ASKED BUT WAS NOT ANSWERED IN THE "BIBBLE," WHEN GOD SAID, CAIN, WHERE IS YOUR BROTHER? AND CAIN SAID, AM I MY BROTHER'S KEEPER? AND THERE WAS NO ANSWER. BUT THE ANSWER WE OUGHT TO GIVE IS, NOT ONLY MY BROTHER'S KEEPER, BUT MY SISTER'S KEEPER ALSO. IF WE ARE ALL ONE FAMILY, WE SHOULD HELP EACH OTHER. THE STRONG ARE TO BEAR THE INFIRMITY OF THE WEAK. THE FRIENDLESS ARE TO HAVE A HAND EXTENDED. THOSE WHO ARE POSSESSED OF DEVILS, AS THEY CALLED IT IN THE PAST--WE CALL IT MENTAL ILLNESS NOW--SHOULD NOT BE LOCKED AWAY LIKE PEOPLE DID IN THE OLD DAYS, IN A CLOSET, BECAUSE PEOPLE ARE ASHAMED AND THERE'S A STIGMA ATTACHED TO SOMEBODY BEING AFFLICTED WITH SOMETHING THAT THEY'RE NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR. AND WE'RE OUR BROTHER AND OUR SISTER'S KEEPER AND YOU ALL PRAY EVERY MORNING. I DON'T PRAY, EVER. AND I'D MATCH WHATEVER IT IS I BELIEVE OR DON'T BELIEVE AGAINST ANYTHING YOU SAY THAT YOU BELIEVE, BECAUSE I DO PRACTICE WHAT I BELIEVE. YOU DON'T AND YOU WON'T. BUT WITH ALL THAT HAVING BEEN SAID, I'M GOING TO FOLLOW ALL THESE RULES THAT I'M GOING TO VOTE AGAINST. I'M GOING TO BE A "NO" VOTE. AND I'M GOING TO ASK FOR A ROLL CALL VOTE SO IT'S UP THERE AND PEOPLE WILL KNOW WHAT I'M DOING AND WHERE I STAND. THEN MY CONDUCT IS GOING TO BEAR OUT WHAT I'M SAYING. YOU

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

CAN'T SAY THAT, THOUGH. YOU CAN SAY IT WHEN YOU'RE BY YOURSELF, BUT WHEN THOSE CHAINS GROW TIGHT AND THE OTHER END IS IN THE HAND OF A SPECIAL INTEREST AND THAT INTEREST PULLS THAT CHAIN TIGHT, YOU'RE GOING TO GO THE DIRECTION THAT CHAIN IS PULLING YOU. NOT ME. ALTHOUGH WE STILL, PEOPLE OF MY COMPLEXION, ARE VIRTUALLY ENSLAVED, I AM THE FREEST MAN IN THIS UNIVERSE. NOBODY OWNS ME,...

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...NEITHER GOD, NOR DEVIL, NOR HUMAN BEING. I AM MY OWN MASTER. AND WHEN I HAVE NO FRIEND ANYWHERE ELSE, NOBODY I CAN RELY ON, I WILL ALWAYS HAVE ONE FRIEND. AND THAT ONE FRIEND IS DEEP DOWN INSIDE OF MYSELF. I KNOW WHAT THAT FRIEND WILL DO AND THAT FRIEND KNOWS WHAT I WILL DO. AND OUR FIRST AND CARDINAL PRINCIPLE IS THAT NEITHER OF US WILL BETRAY THE OTHER. SO LET US WATCH BY CONDUCT AND SEE WHO MOST LIVES WHAT HE OR SHE PROFFESSES: I WHO WILL VOTE NO AGAINST THESE RULES OR YOU WHO WILL VOTE YES FOR THESE RULES. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: SEEING NO ONE ELSE IN THE QUEUE, SENATOR GARRETT, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE ON THE ADOPTION OF THE PERMANENT RULES.

SENATOR GARRETT: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER. COLLEAGUES, THANK YOU FOR YOUR THOUGHTFUL CONSIDERATION OF THE RULES. AND FOR THOSE OF YOU WHO SUBMITTED PROPOSED RULE CHANGES, THANK YOU. WE GAVE THOUGHTFUL DELIBERATION IN COMMITTEE. AND THANK YOU FOR YOUR SPIRITED DEBATE HERE THIS MORNING AND THIS AFTERNOON, AND I ENCOURAGE YOU TO ADOPT THE PERMANENT RULES. THANK YOU.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ROLL CALL.

SPEAKER HADLEY: REGULAR ORDER, SENATOR? THERE'S BEEN A REQUEST FOR A ROLL CALL VOTE IN REGULAR ORDER. MR. CLERK.

CLERK: (ROLL CALL VOTE TAKEN.) 34 AYES, 8 NAYS, MR. PRESIDENT, ON THE MOTION TO ADOPT PERMANENT RULES.

SENATOR KRIST PRESIDING

SENATOR KRIST: THE MOTION IS SUCCESSFUL. MR. CLERK, ANY ITEMS?

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, I HAVE NEW BILLS. (READ LB372-LB375 BY TITLE FOR

Floor Debate
January 15, 2015

THE FIRST TIME.) NEW RESOLUTION: SENATOR EBKE OFFERS LR27; THAT WILL BE LAID OVER. HEARING NOTICE FROM HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES. NAME ADD: SENATOR PANSING BROOKS TO LB89; SENATOR MELLO TO LB371. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGES 192-194.) [LB372 LB373 LB374 LB375 LB89 LB371 LR27]

SENATOR KRIST: THE CHAIR RECOGNIZES SPEAKER HADLEY FOR AN ANNOUNCEMENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. WE WILL CONTINUE WITH OUR PLANS TO START AT 9:00 TOMORROW MORNING. WE WILL CONTINUE WITH ACCEPTANCE OF BILLS. AND BASICALLY WHEN WE GET FINISHED WITH THAT, EXCEPT FOR ANY COMMITTEE MEETINGS SUCH AS THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND SUCH AS THAT, WE WILL BE DONE FOR THE DAY THEN. THANK YOU.

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER. COLLEAGUES, BILL REQUESTS SUBMITTED TO THE BILL DRAFTING STAFF BY 5:00 ON FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, WILL BE GUARANTEED TO BE READY FOR INTRODUCTION BEFORE ADJOURNMENT ON THE TENTH LEGISLATIVE DAY, TENTH LEGISLATIVE DAY, THE LAST DAY FOR BILL INTRODUCTION, WHICH IS SCHEDULED TO BE WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 21. REQUESTS RECEIVED AFTER 5:00 P.M. ON FRIDAY WILL BE DRAFTED IF TIME PERMITS. HOWEVER, PRIORITY WILL BE GIVEN TO THE REQUESTS RECEIVED BEFORE THE FRIDAY DEADLINE. IF THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS, YOU CAN CONTACT MY OFFICE. ANYTHING FURTHER, MR. CLERK?

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, I HAVE A PRIORITY MOTION. SENATOR KEN HAAR WOULD MOVE TO ADJOURN THE BODY UNTIL FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, AT 9:00 A.M.

SENATOR KRIST: YOU'VE HEARD THE MOTION. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR? OPPOSED? WE ARE ADJOURNED.