

January 9, 1989

LB 112, 202-240
LR 3

LBs 202-240 for the first time by title. See pages 100-108 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, I have a notice of hearing by Senator Rod Johnson who is Chair of the Agriculture Committee for Tuesday, January 17.

Mr. President, Senator Hannibal would like to announce that Senator Conway has been selected as Vice-Chair of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Committee.

Mr. President, a new resolution, LR 3. It is offered by Senator Baack and a number of the members. (Read brief explanation. See pages 108-109 of the Legislative Journal.) That will be laid over, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I have a request from Senator Smith to withdraw LB 112. That will be laid over. I believe that is all that I have, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Senator Lynch, are you ready to go back to work now? We will return back to adopting of permanent rules. Senator Lynch.

SENATOR LYNCH: Mr. President and members, I have one more proposed committee amendment, simple little amendment. It has to do with cloture. This change would adopt a cloture rule that would become effective after 12 hours debate at each stage of debate on any appropriation bill, and after 8 hours at each stage of debate on all other bills. To briefly explain it, and then Senator Moore will take it from there, let me give you a scenario. Some of you may be familiar with 428, the motorcycle helmet bill. It was my bill. An amendment, say, was offered under this rule by Senator Moore to the bill. As you know, sometimes amendments can take and need more time for discussion and debate than the bill, itself. After 8 hours of debate on Select File, I would move for cloture, or if that bill happened to be a committee bill, the chairman of the committee would move for cloture. The presiding officer then, under this proposal, would immediately recognize the motion and orders debate to cease on Moore's amendment. The vote on the Moore amendment would be taken without further debate. After that, a vote on the cloture motion without debate, 33 votes would be needed for that motion on cloture would be successful. If the cloture motion were successful, a vote on the advancement of the bill,

February 21, 1989 LB 154, 227, 298, 318, 408, 440, 713

Select File with E & R amendments, LB 318 Select File with E & R amendments, LB 440 Select File with E & R and LB 154 Select File with E & R. (See pages 794-97 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, Speaker Barrett has amendments to be printed to LB 408. (See page 797 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, your Committee on Transportation whose Chair is Senator Lamb to whom was referred LB 227 instructs me to report the same back to the Legislature with the recommendation it be advanced to General File with committee amendments attached and LB 713 General File with committee amendments attached. (See page 797 of the Legislative Journal.) That is all that I have, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. We'll move on to Select File, LB 298.

CLERK: Mr. President, LB 298 is on Select File. I have no E & R. I do have an amendment to the bill, Mr. President, from Speaker Barrett. The amendment is found on page 721 of the Journal.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Speaker Barrett, please. Just a moment, Speaker. (Gavel.) Could we please have it a little quieter so we can hear the speakers. Speaker Barrett.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. President and members. The amendment being offered on LB 298 I think addresses a couple of concerns that came up on General File when the bill was discussed for the first time. LB 298, as you recall, is the bill that raises the rates to be paid for publication of legal notices. A couple of major concerns I believe were voiced on the floor when we did debate the bill the first time. One of the questions was whether or not a political subdivision finds that it can't find a newspaper which will publish any notice at the legal rate, and I believe the other concern which was raised involved the question of a public official finding that to publish the type of notice that he or she needs, they would have to pay more than the legal rate. So the amendment which I'm offering offers two new short sections listing three specific situations where the public official could negotiate with a legal newspaper to publish the notice at a rate higher than the legal rate. However, the higher rate does have a cap or a limit. A negotiated rate could never be higher than the newspaper's lowest scheduled rate for classified ads of the type