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Course Updates (3/16/21)
EXAM 1:
Has been e-mailed back. They went well, though I graded them fairly easily. Average was an 88 , which was around my expectation headed in.

| section | median | mean | low | high | points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 95 | 92 | 60 | 100 | 10 |
| 3 | 86.7 | 86 | 66.7 | 95.6 | 45 |
| 4 | 86 | 85.2 | 60 | 100 | 15 |
| 5 | 93.3 | 91.7 | 43.3 | 100 | 30 |
| all | 90.5 | 88.2 | 66 | 98 | 100 |
| EmAILS: |  |  |  |  |  |

MOVING FORWARD:
Grading now, it's been a mixed bag. Clarifications have helped


MOVING FORWARD:
Today: Ideological Scaling; Thursday: U.S. Senate History.
For last week: Watch "Lincoln"; Should have the Carson et al. lecture posted tomorrow.


## Budgetary Magic Tricks

Roll Call $11 / 7 / 17$ - "Tax cuts are not cheap, so when closing so-called oopholes left House Republican tax writers short of their budget target, they dipped into their grab bag of budget and timing tricks. "Once you
that cap in reconciliation instructions, it has to fit," Ways and Means member Carlos Curbelo of Florida said. "So the entire bill is designed to meet the instructions that both chambers passed." Republican congressional leaders are using the budget reconciliation process to consider the tax package, which allows them to bypass Senate procedura roadblocks. The catch is the legislation must adhere to parliamentary
budget rules. The budget reconciliation instructions for the tax overhaul allow the measure to increase the deficit by $\$ 1.5$ trillion over 10 years. Th House bill would cost $\$ 1.4$ trillion over 10 years, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation's estimate.
House Republicans didn't use nearly as many revenue-boosting mechanisms as they could have to improve the score because they believe economic growth will ultimately offset any static revenue losses. But the House faces fewer constraints than the Senate will. The Senate's budget reconciliation rules mandate that any policy that is to be made permanent under the measure not add to the deficit outside the 10-yea budget window, meaning it must be fully offset.


Since it was Senate Republicans that first came up with the $\$ 1.5$-trillion-deficit-adding instruction, they appear to acknowledge that full permanency is likely an unachievable goal. But the closer Republicans want to get to that goal, the more so-called budget gimmicks they may need to employ."
Balanced budget requirements and PAYGO rules sound attractive to voters, but members of Congress have means of getting around them. This includes things like: (1) Delaying Start Dates; (2) Early expirations; (3) Capping and indexing.

Again, we care about the content, not the bill. Hence, multiple bills.
Typical index breakdown: Introduction/referral, reported out of committee, specia rule/suspension (if either occurs), debate and amending, passes chamber, referred to new chamber committee, reported, special rule/suspension (if either occurs), debate and amending, passes chamber, conference, president

Flood Control Act of 1936


A landmark piece of legislation, the Flood Control Act of 1936 authorized the US Army Corps of Engineers to construct levees, dikes and flood control measures to promote the public's safety. It would be amended in 1968 to provide for a Federal Flood Insurance Program.
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Flood Control Act of 1936


Hic, No. 738,], 10894.
This is essentially a Rivers and Harbors Appropriations Act...There's only one bill, H.R. 8455 and one special rule (Hres 349). It passed in the second session, so there's a good chance it was considered in both the first and second session (so check both indices).
In this case, this bill was considered in the first session and passed the House. It's then-weirdly-considered in the Senate but "Recommitted to the Committee on Commerce." It's then passed in the second session.

This means we should be looking for two motions to proceed in the Senate (on in the second session), in addition to the motion to recommit in the Senate.

Flood Control Act of 1936


The rule is where we'd expect. However, despite being an "open rule," debate over it is a bit more heated. Most of the discussion is confined to the merits of the bill as opposed to the rule, however. Opponents are dubbing the proposal a "pork-barrel" bill. This was fairly common with rivers and harbors bills.
The previous question motion was adopted by voice vote. The minority leader, Rep. Bertrand Snell (R-NY), then requests the yeas and nays after a division vote on the role. It passes 239-112.

Flood Control Act of 1936
The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is
ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.
The bill was ordered to be engrossed, read a third time and was read the third time.
The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the The SPEAKER. The question ts on the passage of the Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, on the final passage of the The year the yeas and nays.
The question was taken; and there were-yeas 153, nays
141, not voting 136, as follows: 141, not voting 136, as follows:


Minorits Leader Bentrant Snell (R-NT. For some reason, here's
a picture of him riding a carousel horss and wearing a goofy hat
House debate is fairly straight forward. Engrossment and third reading can be found right before the question is put on final passage (right at the page the index identifies as before the question is put on final passage (righ

Snell requests the yeas and nays on final passage and they are granted. The measure passes 153-141. The Recorded Vote database lists the vote as occurring on S. 8455. That's clearly a typo. There is no motion to recommit.

Flood Control Act of 1936

## mptorixam of anves and hazons

Mr. COPELaND. Mt. Presldent, I Dow ask unanimous consunt thas the Sonate proced to the consideration of tho bill (H. R. 8155) authoriaing the construction of certain public worts on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes.
There being no objection, the Scente proceeded to con. slder the bill (H. R. B55) authorizing the construction of
 certain public works on rivers and hartors for Aocd control,

It took a little digging to find the original motion to proceed in the Senate, but a key word search here helped. It's offered by Senator Royal Copeland (D-NY) and adopted via search here helped.
unanimous consent.

Flood Control Act of 1936


Here's where this gets weird.
Again, we know from the index (and the notes) that this measure is then defeated (or at least delayed) by a motion to recommit in the Senate. A search through newspapers at the time, as well as the debate, suggests this was largely backed by Senator Millard Tydings (D-MD), who filibustered the bill on the grounds it was "pork barrel legislation."
Above is the newspaper search and a headline. You don't need to do this for your coding.

Flood Control Act of 1936


Here's the Voteview vote on the motion to recommit. Again, it's rare to see one of these succeed. Note the huge number of missing votes and nearly unified Republican support.

## Flood Control Act of 1936

 (Laughter.1 If my friend wants to priale Rast St. Louls, not pass upon leeislation of thws maeritude without any

 stiver is dug at Eit St St. Louis, when I think of the hardships when it nexte conveness in January.
of the backed-up commerce of the millions upon millions The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-nine Senators havof western farmers who will hava no outhet to the sea, may ing answered to thetr names, haorum trion the motion of the senator from Maryland timr. I say that I, with the Senator from Illinois, take my stand Trorrass to recommit the bill to the Committec on Comby the side of old East St. Louis. May she stand there like merce win mas. On that I
ydered. the yeas and nays.
ample sppropriacion to accelcratic her greainess, from the President pro tempore. That senator has not
And may the odors that come down the river from the voted
stockyards of Chlesgo never erow less fragrant. (Laughter.) Sernt Townser from Tennesse. Not knowing how he woud wote, I
But think not that the men have any monopoly upon the am compeenced to witharaw my vote. 2 The reult wis anounced-yes,
religion of legislation. There is St. Genevileve Levee, St. The result was announced-yeas 29, nays 20 , as follows:
Ceneviev. [Laughter.] Mr. LEWIS. Sweet Genevien
Mr. TYDINOS. Sweet Genevieve receives $\$ 333,000$.
Above are some highlighted quotes from the debate
The motion to recommit can be found several pages before the voted on page highlighted in the index.

Note: This is a motion to recommit with instructions. It's adopted via recorded vote requested by Tydings).

Flood Control Act of 1936

$\qquad$
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$\qquad$ A bit of digging reveals the motion to proceed is again offered by Copeland, this time agreed oo by voice vot
$\qquad$
Debate is fairly muted this time around, and engrossment and third reading and final passage are both accomplished via voice vote two days later. This sends the bill back to the House

Flood Control Act of 1936


The pressidna officgr. The oustion is on andeIns to the conterence enport
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
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Consideration of the conference reports go smoothly. It passes the Senate via voice.
On the House side, it's adopted the same day it's brought up (as it was in the House). It initially passes via division, 117-18, but Rep. Chester Thompson (D-IL) asks for the yeas and nays in the House. It's granted and passes 297-51.
$\qquad$
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$\qquad$ The efort mis agred to.
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There will often be a Senate companion bill introduced around the same time as the House.

Generally though, the Senate will wait for the House bill before it moves out of Committee.

Committee consideration can be bypassed in the Senate via Rule XIV.

Senate Committee/Subcommittee


Referred by the Majority Leader (with assistance). This can also be complicated. Additionally, the Majority Leader can put a bill directly on the calendar (bypassing the committee stage).

Similar to House Committee consideration...It may go to a subcommittee as well. Committee marks up the bill, holds hearing, invites witnesses.

Full text substitutes are common.

## Getting Before the Chamber



## Senate Floor

Here's where the process generally gets
weird.
No feature comparable to the House
Rules Committee. Lack of a simplemajoritarian method for ending debate makes the Senate extremely unique. So how does a bill get to the Senate floor? Leader will offer a motion to proceed. But ending debate on that is difficult.

Primarily two options:
(1) Cloture. 60 votes and extremely timeconsuming. May need cloture on the
 motion to proceed and then on the bill itself.
(2) Unanimous Consent. Necessitates even more compromises then cloture.

## UCA Example

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, lask unanimous consent that the
Senate now resume consideration of S. 919, the national service bi that the cloture vote scheduled today on the Kennedy-Durenberger substitute amendment to the bill be vitiated; that the KennedyDurenberger amendment be agreed to

That the committee substitute, as amended, be further an
notwithstanding the adoption of the Kennedy-Durenberger
substitute; that the following be the only first-degree amendments remaining in order to the bill and that these amendments must be elevant; that they be subject to relevant second-degree
mendments; that all amendments must be offered by the close of lose of business today the committee substitute, as amended be agreed to and the bill be read a third time..

TThat at 9:45 a.m. on Tuesday, August 3, the Senate resume consideration of S . 919 ; that there be 15 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form at that time; and that at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, August 3, the Senate proceed to the immediate
consideration of H.R. 2010, the House companion, that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 919, as amended, be inserted in lieu thereof and a vote on passage of the bill occur without any intervening action or debate; that immediately upon the conclusion of that vote the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two
Houses, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees, and that
S. 919 then be indefinitely postponed..


Above: Former Senate Majority Leader George
Mitchel ( (O-ME)

## UCA Example



Mr. DOLE. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I think we have a satisfactory arrangement. Let me ust make the record clear, we did not have the votes to have voted for cloture today, and we would have been one vote short. I commend the solidarity on the other side. I wish we could have it on this side, but we did not have it on this particular issue. I still hope before they finish the debate th afternoon there can be some adjustment on funding It might make a significant difference in the number of Republicans supporting the bill. As I understood the bipartisan support. But in any event, I think this is a good resolution. It avoids a cloture vote. We do not have the postcloture situation. All of these amendments are, I think, germane and relevant.

Nobody is trying to slip anything in. I commend the majority leader for his patience, and I still hope we can work out a funding level that might be satisfactory to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts later on today (103rd Congress, Congressional Record, July 30, 1993, S9938)
Understanding the filibuster
The Senate "filibuster" is not a rule
in the Senate (sorry, Mr. President).
It owes its existence to the absence
of a rule allowing a simple majority
to end a debate.
Rule XXII, or cloture, established in
1917, provides for a supermajority
to end debate.
Historically, floor time is so valuable in the Senate that measures subject to
filibusters are not brought to the floor and cloture votes are not taken.
Because of this, determining when a filibuster has taken place-or providing
a count of filibusters-is almost completely arbitrary.
Senate Floor
Understanding the filibuster
Often times, obstruction through long
speeches on the Senate floor are for
"show." See recent speeches by
Senators Paul (R-KY), Cruz (R-TX) and
Merkley (D-OR).
Even when cloture is not invoked, the
Senate's debate rules have an effect on
policy output. See Senator Tom Coburn
(R-OK) and the Zadroga Health
Compensation Act of 2010.
Because of workload and time
demands, the modern U.S. Senate is
largely run by unanimous consent.

## Senate Floor

The amending process on the
Senate floor is crazy.
Individual members have a great deal of leverage, so we see a large number of amendments offered and voted on in the Senate.

Most are of the position-taking variety. Why do this?

Some will be bills offered "as amendments."


Can be offered as motions to strike, strike and insert, etc....A major job for staffers and interns is summarizing amendments and writing vote recommendations for their members. Unlike bills, where members have a great deal of notice and information from committee mark-ups, introductory speeches, lobbyists and party leaders, amendments are often offered with no supplemental information and very little time to process.


## News-Filling the Amendment Tree

Roll Call 10/27/14-Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid's decision to avoid tough votes this year has backfired in one respect - it gave his vulnerable incumbents few opportunities to show off any independence from President Barack Obama.
As senior writer Shawn Zeller writes in this week's CQ Weekly cover story, Democrats who have been distancing themselves from Obama on the
campaign trail not in votes on the Senate floor whether it be Mark Udall of Colorado, Mark Pryor of Arkansas or Mary L. Landrieu of Louisiana


Udall disagreed just once, on a Pennsylvania state judge's nomination to a federal district court. Pryor parted with Obama three times, and Landrieu four, but only one of those votes was on a policy matter. In July, Landrieu voted against Obama's request for $\$ 2.7$ billion to deal with the surge of Latin American children entering the U.S. illegally. $\qquad$
Indeed, all of the most vulnerable Democrats voted with President Obama at least 96 percent of the time on the 120 votes on which Obama has urged a "yes" or "no" vote. Reid clamped down on amendments more than ever this year and the bills he brought to the floor were aimed at unifying Democrats and putting Republicans on defense - like a the floor were aimed at unifying Democrats and putting Republicans on defense - like a
minimum wage hike, an unemployment extension, pay equity or refinancing student loans - rather than bills that would lead to Democratic defections.


On Thursday, the National Republican Senatorial Committee issued separate releases targeting Democrats citing the figures. Those releases are virtually identical, with NRSC spokeswoman Brook Hougesen offering quotes that differ only in the name of the senator being targeted and the voting percentage figures from CQ Roll Call.
"Mark Begich is no independent; this year he actually voted for President Obama's agenda an astounding $98 \%$ of the time," Hougesen said in the Alaska version of the releases. "President Obama is right, a vote for Mark Begich is a vote for his policies."

## Roll Call Voting

Not the default vote mechanism in Congress. Most voting in Congress is completed via voice vote

Recorded votes must be requested by a
member and the request must be supported by one-fifth of present members (Article I, Section 5, Clause 3)
Some debate over this at the Constitutional Convention
Several delegates supported dropping the quorum threshold, others opposed the yeas and nays altogether.

After several failed and one successfu amendment, the yeas and nays clause was adopted
Four primary vote types in Congress: (1) voice vote; (2) division vote; (3) teller vote; (4) roll call vote

$\qquad$
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$\qquad$
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Origins of Recorded Voting
The practice of publicizing how legislators $\qquad$ voted occurred on rare occasion in 17th and 18th century Great Britain.

The first known instance of this occurred in 1641, after a vote ordering the execution of Thomas Wentworth, the 1st Earl of Strafford.

The names of those who voted against the bill of attainder were publicized as "betrayers of their country (Luce 1922, 355)." The vote passed and Strafford was eventually beheaded.

Note: One co-author does not appreciate
Above: Strafford (with head) this anecdote and feels it is unnecessary. He is wrong.


The rare Sunday votes set the stage for the Senate to send a long-term highway bill tied to the Ex-Im Bank to the House later this week, but not before facing other gambits by conservatives, including a procedural vote forced by Sen. Ted Cruz regarding the Iran deal...
A bipartisan coalition beat back a filibuster of the Export-Import Bank amendment proposed by Sen. Mark S. Kirk, R-III., on a 67-26 vote. Neither vote was a surprise.
Cruz's Iran sanctions amendment was the next order of business, but his maneuver was quickly shot down.
 of telling a "simple lie," the Republican presidential hopeful set up a procedural vote on whether he should be allowed to offer an amendment to the highway bill to bar sanctions relief for Iran until the country releases Americans and recognizes Israel as a Jewish state.
Procedurally, Cruz sought to offer a third-degree amendment - something barred by longstanding Senate precedent. Allowing such amendments would upend the prerogative of the majority leader to control the flow of debate through the process known as filling the the majority leader
Cruz's effort failed on a voice vote after being unable to secure a "sufficient second" for a roll call vote (requiring the backing of 11 senators). Cruz's frequent ally, Sen. Mike Lee of Utah, saw a similar rejection on an amendment that would block funding for Planned Parenthood.
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## Sources: Harry Reid Sleeping With Mitch <br> McConnell's Wife In 1986 At Core Of Senate

 Gridlock $\qquad$
"Senate: Origins and Development"

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Prof. Anthony Madonna } \\
& \text { POLS 4600 Maymester } \\
& 5 / 26 / 2020 \\
& \text { University of Georgia }
\end{aligned}
$$
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| Evolution of Senate Rules |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| I. The Nuclear Option in the Senate <br> a. Gorsuch and the Nuclear Option <br> b. The Nuclear Option in 2013 | Filli-baster. |
| II. Procedure Basics <br> a. Why rules? <br> b. Always a limit to rules <br> c. Everyone is a hypocrite |  |
| III. Understanding the Senate <br> a. The filibuster is not a rule <br> b. How do we count them? <br> c. Workhorses v. Showhorses <br> d. Unanimous Consent | V. Obstruction in the Senate <br> a. Early Senate <br> b. Bank Bill of 1841 <br> c. Force Bill of 1891 <br> d. Eleven Willful Men <br> e. Richard Russell and Civil Rights |
| IV. How Did We Get Here? <br> a. The Constitution/Founders <br> b. Majority Will <br> c. Path Dependency | f. Post-Russell Senate <br> VI. Where Are We Going? a. Concluding Thoughts |

$\qquad$
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The Nuclear Option in the Senate


On April 6, 2017, Senate Republicans created a new precedent that formally ended the prospect of "filibusters" on Supreme Court nominations.

- Claimed it was a necessary response to an unprecedented use of obstruction on a Supreme Court nominee.
- Democrats argued it violated the intent of the founders in establishing the Senate and damaged one of the "pillars of Democracy."

- Republicans cited a precedent created on November 20, 2013, by Senate Democrats under Harry Reid (D-NV). That decision established that executive and lower court nominations no longer needed to clear a supermajority cloture threshold.
- "More than half of the Nation's population lives in parts of the country that have been declared a judicial emergency." - Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV)
- "Just sit down, shut up, and rubber stamp everything, everyone the president sends up here." Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY)


## The Nuclear Option in the Senate

- The Washington Post argued it "change[d] how the nation is governed in a significant way."
- The New York Times dubbed it "the most fundamental alteration of its rules in more than a generation"
- Steven S. Smith listed it as "among the three or four most important events in the procedural history of the Senate."
- Why? How does the Senate operate and how has it changed?

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
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## The Nuclear Option in the Senate

The "Nuclear Option" action was controversial in part because the Senate accomplished it not by amending its rules, but instead by overturning, on appeal, a decision of the chair. The decision held that Senate rules required a super-majority of three fifths of the full chamber to impose limits on
 consideration.
$\qquad$

By its vote on the appeal, the Senate established a parliamentary precedent under which the vote of a simple majority can limit consideration of any nomination except one to the Supreme Court. Formally, this action represented a re-
interpretation by the Senate of its existing rules, determining that those rules empower a simple majority to limit consideration of the specified nominations.


## The Nuclear Option in the Senate

Sources: Harry Reid Sleeping With Mitch
McConnell's Wife In 1986 At Core Of Senate
Gridlock


Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) argued there was ample precedent for the maneuver. Reid, citing to a memo circulated by Senator Jeff Merkley (D-OR), noted "the Senate has changed its rules 18 times, by sustaining or overturning the ruling of the Presiding Officer, in the last 36 years..."

Minority Party Republicans disagreed. Senator Chuck Grassley (R-IA) dubbed it a "naked power grab and nothing more than a power grab". Senator John McCain (R-AZ) argued that "if only a majority can change the rules, then there are no rules." And Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) accused Reid and Senate Democrats of "break[ing] the rules of the Senate in order to change the rules of the Senate."


[^0]$\qquad$
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## Understanding the Senate

- The Senate and the House evolved in two drastically different ways. Since the 1890s, the House has been a majoritarian body dominated by the Speaker and Rules Committee.
- The Senate never granted its leadership the same strong, formal powers the House did.

- Its governed by both formal rules and precedents, which have been remarkably stable since its creation.
- With the ability to offer non-germane amendments, the ability of senators to "filibuster" is one of the most recognizable features of the chamber.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
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## Understanding the Senate

- Often times, obstruction through long speeches on the Senate floor are for "show." See recent speeches by Senators Paul (R-KY), Cruz (R-TX) and Merkley (D-OR).
- Even when cloture is not invoked, the Senate's debate rules have an effect on policy output. See Senator Tom Coburn (R-OK) and the Zadroga Health Compensation Act of 2010.
- Because of workload and time demands, the modern U.S. Senate is largely run by unanimous consent.


How Did We Get Here?

"Why," asked Washington, "did you just now pour that coffee into your saucer, before drinking?"
"To cool it," answered Jefferson, "my throat is not made of brass."
"Even so," rejoined Washington,
"we pour our legislation into the senatorial saucer to cool it."

- Several alternative hypotheses: Majority will, path dependency, deference to the founders.
- Easy to reject "deference to the founders."
- Little evidence suggesting the founder support supermajority rule in the chamber. Several wrote pieces explicitly opposed.
- Constitution says very little about congressional rules. Article 1, Section 5, Clause 2 states that "Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings."
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
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|  | How Did We Get Here? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| - | Several alternative hypotheses: Majority <br> will, path dependency, deference to the <br> founders. |

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
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| How Did We Get Here? |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| - Majority will: Minorities have reined in their dilatory behavior in the face or and norms of restraint. |  |
| Weaker support for this claim as well. |  |
| - Senate majorities are not fixed and rarely enjoy universally high levels of support across issues. |  |
| was rare in the $19^{\text {th }}$ and early 20 century, this was likely due to a product costs. |  |
| - Sidenote: You might be asking: Is that the creepiest photo of Vice President John C. Breckinridge? | vampire hunter, |

How Did We Get Here?


No it is not.
How Did We Get Here?

- Path dependency: Minorities have exploited existing rules to frustrate potential reforms. In this view, the modern Senate is not what majorities have wanted but what they have been forced to accept.

| Inherited Rule | Source | Consequence |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elimination of the Previous <br> Question Motion | 1806 Rules Codification | The Senate no longer had a formal <br> method of ending debate by a <br> simple majority. |
| Staggered Senate Terms | U.S. Constitution | The Senate is a "continuing body" <br> and does not adopt new rules at <br> the start of each Congress. |
| The Vice President's Status as the <br> President of the Senate | U.S. Constitution | Centralized chamber power could <br> be wielded by a member that does <br> not share the interests of the <br> Senate majority |


$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
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$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## How Did We Get Here?

- Calhoun refused.
- "Mark the consequences! If the VicePresident should belong to the same party or interest which brought the President into power, or if he be dependent of him for his political standing or advancement, you will virtually place the control over the freedom of debate in the hands of the Executive."- Vice President John C. Calhoun, 1826.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ distinguished general wise magistrates,
$\qquad$ debates of Europe."
$\qquad$ Senate's 'Golden Age' has largely overstated debate and behavior in the era.


## Obstruction in the Senate



- The early Senate was a miserable place to debate. Senators were frequently in bad health, which was exacerbated by a poorly ventilated building which made the air was difficult to breath.
- Travel conditions were equally onerous and members were usually forced to abandon families for lengthy periods of time.
- Whiskey was sold in the capitol and intoxication was tolerated on the floor of the Senate during this period. Duels and violence was relatively commonplace in the era.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


## Obstruction in the Senate

- An early example of effective obstruction in the Senate occurred during consideration of the Bank Bill of 1841 .
- The United States was in the midst of a substantial economic depression in 1840. Since the financial panic of 1837, a substantial number of chartered banks failed, stock prices dropped dramatically and investment growth plummeted.
- The Whigs criticized the Democrats for not being aggressive enough in combating the depression. They ran on a platform that called for an increase in
 government intervention.
- The election of 1840 produced a resounding victory for the Whig party. But Harrison dies shortly after taking office.

Other measures include the Oregon
Territory Bill of 1846; Nebraska Act of
1853; Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854;
Kansas Statehood Bill of 1856;
Lecompton Act of 1858; Cuba Acquisition
Act of 1858; Habeas Corpus
Indemnification Act of 1862.
The Federal Elections Bill, introduced in


## Obstruction in the Senate

- The filibuster forced an ambitious Republican Party to pick and choose between the Federal Elections Bill, the Tariff Bill, and other major legislation.
- It exasperated divisions within the Republican Party on these issues and forced bill managers to make compromises on legislation.
- Finally, by refusing to debate Senate Democrats and prolong the filibuster, the Republicans were forced to Republican Senator prolong the filibuster, the Republicans were forced to here who does not know views against the bill.

"There is not a that between now and December time enough can not be found to pass both the tariff bill and an election bill."William Pierce Frye (RME).

Obstruction in the Senate

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

- A formal cloture rule was not established until 1917, after extreme circumstances.
- Southern Democrats and Progressive Republicans filibuster a measure providing for the arming of merchant ships considered in a lame duck Congress.
- President Wilson aggressively criticized the obstructing senators, labeling them a "little group of eleven willful men."
- A rule providing for two-thirds cloture was then adopted 76-3.

- Cloture was rarely employed in the early $20^{\text {th }}$ century.
- Throughout the century, obstruction was rare and largely reserved to Civil Rights legislation. Played a role in defeating Anti-Lynching legislation in 1922, 1935 and 1938; Anti-poll tax legislation in 1946; Fair employment bills in 1946; 1950; a right to work measure and open housing legislation in 1966.
- Attempts to bypass the filibuster by reforming Senate rules were made in 1967, 1969 and 1971 but defeated by Southerners, led by Senator Richard Russell (D-GA).


## Obstruction in the Senate

1949: Russell led the fight to change the cloture rule to require two-thirds of the whole Senate to cut-off debate, instead of present and voting.

- 1954: Drafted the Southern Manifesto declaring Brown v. the Board of Education "a clear abuse of judicial power."
- 1957: Denounced the Civil Rights Act even after it had been substantially weakened under his leadership.
- Worked to block changes to Senate filibuster rules in 1953 and 1959.
- "In the debate over the 1960 civil rights bill, he organized his three squads of southerners to break the back of the exhausted civil rights supporters, block cloture and gut the legislation." -- Purdum
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Obstruction in the Historical Senate


- After the adopted of substantive civil rights legislation and Russell's death, obstruction in the chamber significantly increased.
- Coincided as well with an increase in workload, political polarization electoral competitiveness.
- Issues like nominations, which hadn't been political, are now tracked by interest groups.


Where are We Going?


- Legislative filibuster unlikely to be substantially altered. Doing so would involve substantial policy concessions by centrist majority party members. $\qquad$
- Carve-outs are a greater threat to its long-term existence.
- The increase in messaging amendments has further threatened the stability of Senate rules, though substantial reform in this area is also unlikely in the short-term.

Questions, Concerns, Angry Rants?

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
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$\qquad$
Tomorrow: The Amending Process in the Senate


[^0]:    ## Basics of Legislative Procedure

    - There are always limits to rules and precedents.
    - On one extreme these limits can be imposed by violence.
    - Less extreme limits can come from altering endogenous rules by majority vote.
    - Regardless, such changes do impose costs on majority and individuals within majority coalitions.

