

September 30, 1992 LB 10

Government Committee for trying to find a way to accomplish the goal for General Fund reduction and mitigating the impact to the guardsmen. And the fact is, you know, unless you impact the guardsmen in some way, there is no way you can help the General Fund. I mean, you can shift it off to the college in tuition remissions and what may or may not happen. You know the fact is if you want to cut this budget, you're going to have to cut it at its source, at the guards people, and that's not fun to do, but going back to what spin you are putting on it, it is not the end of the world if you do it, nor is it...nor are you saying what guards people do is not worthwhile. We are all in full support of that. It is a reasonable reduction given the light of what some neighboring states do. It certainly gives more in ability to recruit. Obviously, in the one example Senator Hillman said, we still are far and away a better package for interested recruits than our neighbors to the south. It is worth \$300,000. I think the body has debated it fully. I encourage the body to advance the bill to Final Reading.

SPEAKER BAACK: You have heard the closing on the advancement of LB 10, and we do have a request for a machine vote. We will now take that vote. All those in favor vote aye, opposed vote no. We are voting on the advancement of LB 10, have you all voted?

SENATOR MOORE: A call of the house and a roll call vote.

SPEAKER BAACK: A call of the house has been requested. All those in favor vote aye, opposed vote no. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 21 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, to go under call.

SPEAKER BAACK: The house is under call. All members please report to the Chamber and record your presence, the house is under call. All members are here. Mr. Clerk, you may call the roll.

CLERK: (Roll call vote taken. See page 159 of the Legislative Journal.) 24 ayes, 11 nays, Mr. President, on the advancement.

SPEAKER BAACK: The motion fails, the bill fails to advance.

SENATOR LANDIS: A point of order, would a motion to reconsider the Schimek amendment be in order at this point in the agenda, since the bill has failed to move? Is that motion possible to entertain at this time?