

January 18, 1995

pointed out, we have a clear choice and this proposal that now is before you, the number 15, version two rule change that you should have at your desks that has one or two CBs up in the right corner is the one we're voting on. And this particular version, just to remind the body, says that if two or more amendments or motions are offered to a bill that the principal introducer may raise the question of whether or not the amendments or motions are for dilatory purposes. If the Speaker feels that they are not dilatory, debate simply continues. If the Speaker believes they are, he is required to consult at least for a temporary period of time with the introducer of the bill and also the amendments in an effort to reach an accord and he can, although he doesn't have to, remove the matter from the agenda temporarily for that consultation. After the consultation, the Speaker makes the decision on whether or not those amendments or motions are out of order. A motion to overrule the Chair may be made by the introducer of the amendments and that question can be decided on the ruling as a whole, not on each individual amendment or motion. In no case can the...in no case can the bill or resolution be removed from the agenda for more than the current legislative day. What we have here, I think, is an effort to provide a balanced alternative to the Legislature. This is going to give the Speaker some...something in writing to back him up if he wants to try to move the process along. If he wants to try to work something out with the introducer of the amendments and the bill, he has an opportunity to do that. It gives him some clout, if you will, to try to keep people focused on the business. If the body wants to overrule him and the introducer of the amendments wants to raise that point, they have the opportunity to do that. I guess this is a chance, I think, for the body to make a decision whether we want to do something about this type of rule change or whether we don't. It doesn't go nearly as far as a lot of states do in terms of dealing with this situation. However, in Nebraska where we are one body, one Unicameral, where we don't want the process to be greased too much, I think it's a reasonable compromise. I think it's something we should give a try. These rules are for this two-year session. If the body feels it doesn't work properly or they don't like the way it works, we'll have an opportunity to change it. But if we do nothing, if we do nothing, I suggest to you that I think we're being dilatory in our responsibility to try to do business down here. I think our memories surely can go back to last session, those of us who were here, we surely can remember how many days we said, why can't we talk about