

February 26, 1991 LB 67

SENATOR LAMB: A point of order, Madam Chair. Senator Nelson has put this proposal before you in the form of a motion. However, I believe it is a reconsideration of what we did yesterday, and I would refer the body to page 55 of the Rule Book, Rule 7, Section 7(a). It says, "When a question has been decided, it shall be in order for any member voting with the prevailing side, or not voting, to move for a reconsideration thereof." And then it goes on to say, a motion to reconsider must be made on the same day or the next day. So I think the key word is or phrase is, when a question has been decided, it shall be in order for any member to ask for reconsideration, and, essentially, that is what Senator Nelson has done in my opinion. We passed the amendment as amended by Senator Beutler yesterday. The question was the Lamb amendment as amended by Senator Beutler. Now Senator Nelson has a motion there merely to remove that amendment, and my contention is that it was a question which was decided but it should be a matter of reconsideration rather than another motion, which is exactly the same that happened yesterday. And I would relinquish the rest of my time to Senator Lynch, Chairman of the Rules Committee.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Senator Lynch.

SENATOR LYNCH: Yeah, Madam President, members, although I will disagree with Senator Lamb on the issue, I would have to admit that I agree with him on the suggestion he made that it should be a reconsideration rather than an amendment to the amendment. Obviously, the reason is, if it is an amendment to an amendment, it takes a simple majority. If it is reconsideration, it takes 25. So I know that would make it more difficult and I would agree with what Senator Nelson is trying and attempting to do. However, I would have to admit that I do support the recommendation and suggestion of Senator Lamb.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Lynch and Senator Lamb. I'd ask Senator Nelson if she would respond.

SENATOR NELSON: Madam Speaker, I did, for the body, file a motion yesterday to reconsider. Then some expertise that I will guarantee you knows more about the exact rules and so on than I do, I wish I was as knowledgeable as Senator Chambers and maybe some others in the body. The point is in this is that we have never considered the Lamb motion again or the nature of the motion after the Beutler amendment was filed and that is the