

March 11, 1989

LB 600, 604, 681, 689,  
772, 802, 814, 933,  
981

in the usury bills or banking bills, generally, but I do have interest in following some kind of a schedule so that we can present these to you in a reasonable manner that you can handle during your regular legislative day. Now it would appear to me and I so recommend to you that what we do is to go back to special order, Select File, on the 39th day and finish up in whatever manner you want to finish up but finish up on 276, 279 and 308 and then proceed with 877 and 906. These are all on your agenda for yesterday. This will mean then that you proceed with these and then the special order that was set for today on 609 and 627, and Senator Koch agrees with this, would be set for the 20th of March at ten o'clock in the morning. Now I do ask for indulgence as far as flexibility goes. The office needs a reasonable amount of flexibility. I hope we don't get this far behind in the future. So with that, Mr. President, I make that recommendation on the agenda. Mr. Lieutenant Governor, I make that recommendation.

PRESIDENT: All right. Is there any suggestion to the contrary, otherwise it will stand as the orders of the Speaker or the Speaker's orders, the agenda and so forth stand as proposed by the Speaker. Senator Sieck, you are ready then on going back to pick up 689, are you?

CLERK: Yes, Mr. President, very briefly, if I may, I have an Attorney General's opinion to Senator Haberman. It will be inserted in the Journal. (See pages 1109 and 1110.)

Your Enrolling Clerk has presented to the Governor for his approval the following bills: 600, 604, 681, 772, 802, 814, 932 and 981.

Mr. President, on LB 689, when we considered it last, Senator Sieck had an amendment pending. It was found on page 977.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Sieck.

SENATOR SIECK: Mr. President, members of the body, I asked that it be laid over a little bit before because I couldn't find it in the Journal. All this is is technical amendments to straighten up LB 689. It is just to make it more clear and so it follows the statute. So I move that we adopt this amendment.

PRESIDENT: The question is the adoption of the Sieck amendment to LB 689. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is the adoption of the Sieck amendment to LB 689. All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Have you all voted on the