

February 12, 1991 LB 88

SENATOR LINDSAY: Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I would ask whether this motion is in order. It is my understanding that a bracket motion can bracket to a time certain, or can simply bracket, and I would question whether and ask the Chair for a ruling whether a bracket until a bill catches up or in that type of phrasing is in order?

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Lindsay, my reading of the rule says then that I would say that this is not in order. It is not because it would not be a priority motion. It would only be a priority motion if it would say to a time certain. So I think that this motion, if it is going to be to just bring it up whenever another bill comes up would not get priority status, so that at this time, this motion would be out of order. Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yeah, just a parliamentary inquiry regarding that ruling, you said it would not be a priority motion. Would this be a motion that could be filed on the desk and come up in its own order, and its own order, and then would it be in order. I guess I am not following the rationale here.

SPEAKER BAACK: My understanding is, yes, it could. It could be placed right in the order of other amendments that are pending, and then as that motion came up, then we could consider that motion.

SENATOR WITHEM: A motion to bracket to a date certain is a priority motion. A motion to bracket in general or a conditional sort of bracket is an acceptable motion but not a priority motion, is that the ruling?

SPEAKER BAACK: That is the ruling of this Chair, yes.

SENATOR WITHEM: Okay, thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, not to be difficult or belabor the point but you have kind of come into my territory now and I have to pursue this a bit further. I think the wording of the motion is totally inappropriate because it is asking that the bill be bracketed to a date when something which may not occur...