

January 3, 1990

LB 346, 520, 707, 923-935  
LR 8, 229-233

of LRs 229-233, some of which will be referred to the Reference Committee for referral to the appropriate Standing Committee, others laid over. See pages 123-28 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, I have amendments to be printed from Senator Hall to LB 346 and to LB 707. (See pages 128-29 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, I have a proposed rules change offered by Senator Wesely. That will be referred to the Rules Committee. (See page 129 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, Senator Lynch would like to remind the body that there will be a Rules Committee meeting at one-thirty in Room 1517. And, Mr. President, there will be an Executive Board meeting at two o'clock in Room 1520.

Finally, Mr. President, I have requests to add name to LR 8 by Senator Kristensen and to LB 520 by Senator Smith. (See pages 129-30 of the Legislative Journal.)

PRESIDENT: Ladies and gentlemen, if I could have your attention just a moment, please. We're about out of bills to enter, and if you have some, please bring them up quickly and soon so that we can do this before we adjourn. We're about ready to adjourn, but we don't want to shut anybody off that has one cooking. Incidentally, if you're about ready to introduce one, but not quite, please let the Clerk know that one is coming presently so that we may wind this up. Thank you. We'll not meet this afternoon, of course.

CLERK: (Read by title for the first time, LBs 923-929. See pages 130-31 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, a reminder, the Rules Committee will be meeting at one-thirty this afternoon in Room 1517 and Exec Board will be meeting at two o'clock in Room 1520, signed by Senators Lynch and Labeledz, respectively.

PRESIDENT: Ladies and gentlemen, please get your bills in if you would like. We're about ready to wind this up. Thank you.

CLERK: (Read by title for the first time, LBs 930-935. See pages 131-33 of the Legislative Journal.)

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