

January 4, 1990

LB 881-957, 997-1010
LR 229

If I may, Mr. President, I have a Reference Report referring LBs 881-957, and LR 229. (See pages 175-77 of the Legislative Journal.) And, Mr. President, new bills. (Read LBs 997-1010 by title for the first time. See pages 177-80 of the Legislative Journal.) Mr. President, that's all that I have at this time.

SPEAKER BARRETT PRESIDING

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Proceeding to the next item on...from the Rules Committee. Chairman Lynch.

SENATOR LYNCH: Mr. President, members, the next one is number nine identified on your list. It specifies that a motion to suspend the rules is not divisible. The reason for this, without reading it all but putting it hopefully in laymen's terms so we can understand it, is that when a motion to suspend the rules is attempted it's intended to accomplish only one thing. You don't suspend the rules to accomplish three, four, five or six different things. But, if the amendment that would accomplish one thing would, for example, suspend Rule 1, Section 2, Rule 2, Section 3, Rule 3, Section 4, because it's necessary to do that to identify those sections of the rules that serve that single purpose, you cannot divide the question and take any one of those three rule changes independently. I think, Mr. President and members, that explains the purpose and intent of this rule change and would suggest that we support it.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you, Senator Lynch. Discussion on the proposal...proposed change number nine? Senator Chambers, please.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, let me tell you what the real purpose of this rule change is. There have been attempts at various times to suspend the rules so that there can be no debate or discussion or amendment on bills, and I have indicated that I would divide that question. So the purpose of the rule is to prevent that from happening. So however many things are put into a rule suspension will have to be taken as a package. In some instances you may have a situation where people will think and believe that you should be able to suspend the rules for the purpose of taking a vote without any additional debate, amendment and so forth. And maybe that is all right. Naturally, I'm opposed to it because

January 8, 1990

LB 409, 958-1013, 1031, 1032
LR 235

SPEAKER BARRETT: Let's stand at ease until eleven-fifteen, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you.

EASE

CLERK: Three quick announcements. Reference will meet underneath the south balcony now. Referencing Committee, underneath the south balcony right now.

SPEAKER BARRETT PRESIDING

SPEAKER BARRETT: (Microphone not activated immediately.) ...return to the Legislative Chamber. The Legislature will reconvene and continue our discussion on the adoption of our permanent rules. Please return to the Legislative Chamber. Mr. Clerk, would you read in new bills, please.

CLERK: (Read LB 1031 and LB 1032 by title for the first time. See pages 198-99 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, in addition to those items, I have a new resolution. (Read brief summary of LR 235. See page 199 of the Journal.) That will be laid over.

I have amendments from Speaker Barrett to be printed to LE 409. Mr. President, I also have a Reference Report referring LBs 958-1013, as well as certain gubernatorial appointments received. That's all that I have, Mr. President. (See pages 199-201 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Have you a motion, Mr. Clerk, to reconsider action taken last week?

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Chambers would move to reconsider the vote on the Wesely amendment to the rules, which I believe the Legislature discussed on Thursday afternoon.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. The Chair recognizes Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, this motion is designed to reconsider the vote that was taken on