

fairly innocuous type of change, other than a couple of things caught my eye in here. One of these is compelling the attendance of absent members. I know occasionally that has become an issue in this body as to whether we, those that are in attendance, have the right to compel the attendance of others that are not here at a given time, or whether those individuals are answerable to their constituents for their absence. And I think maybe as I...after I punched my light I had an opportunity to read the committee statement. Maybe this is taken care of, or maybe my question is answered here. One question I have, I'd ask you to respond to, but I'm going to ask two questions and then turn my time over to you to respond, if you care to. But the first question is, is this compelling the attendance of absent members a new concept, or does it tend to be present in other parts of the city ordinances where a majority can compel the attendance of a minority? And the second one is, I think I understand what this means, but I think I'd like to have you explain it where an affirmative vote of at least one-half of the elected members shall be required for the transaction of any business, have a city council of eight members. I assume that doesn't mean that a four-to-four vote passes. I assume that means a four-to-three vote, with one either absent or not voting, would constitute a successful number of votes to pass a measure. Will you respond to those two items, please.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: You're absolutely right that the concept of compelling the attendance of absent members is not unique to this statute. That exists now in statute 16-401, dealing with cities of the first class and larger towns. So I think that...and we have mirrored that language in LB 93. Secondly, the question about what does it mean that the vote must be at least half of the elected members. I think what that really means is there must be a majority of a quorum that support a measure. In other words, if you do have...many towns have five members on the council, smaller towns. If you had...if you had four people there and the vote was two for a measure, one against, and one abstain or something, that would not pass. You would have to have at least one-half, and in that case it would mean at least three of the elected members voting affirmatively in order to pass that measure. So, I guess, that's an example, if that answers your question or not. And I really have nothing further to say. Senator Withem has ferreted out the most intricate parts of this bill, and I don't think I can add