

January 4, 1990

LB 939-968
LR 234

And that is not a valid, logical position. I don't think it is a reasonable legislative position and in order not to drag out the discussion on this resolution, that will be all I have to say except to reemphasize that I intend to vote against this resolution and I'll vote against others of similar stripe.

PRESIDENT: Senator Hannibal, would you like to close...Senator Lynch, your light came on. Senator Hannibal, would you like to close, please.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Chambers, I also have many thoughts running through my head, but I will exercise some constraint as well. I appreciate you pointing up some facts about the issue of what days are Nebraska citizens days and which days are days for all the people that we are elected to serve, and I agree with you wholeheartedly. Senator Smith, I'm not sure I really needed that much support saying that this resolution wasn't near as bad as some of them that we have, but I guess I'll take a vote whenever I can get it. Yes, it is true that each day that we meet in session, as a matter of fact, each day that we serve in the Legislature, is for all the citizens in Nebraska. That is my philosophy as well. However, I would suggest that we have many days that are proclaimed to be special for certain kinds of occasions and, in fact, certain individuals and that to say that because this all day should be for Nebraska citizens and not have a day that we proclaim as a special recognition would be tantamount in my estimation to saying that we shouldn't have a veterans' day because that implies that every other day is not a day that should be recognized for veterans and their service to us or any number of things that we do have. I believe that this is a gesture of recognition that we are here because of the citizens and we are here to serve the citizens and it's not near as bad a resolution as some of them we've passed and I would urge its adoption.

PRESIDENT: The question is the adoption of the resolution. All in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record, please.

CLERK: 15 ayes, 4 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of LR 234.

PRESIDENT: The resolution is adopted. We'll go on to number six, introduction of new bills.

CLERK: Mr. President, new bills. (Read by title for the first time, LBs 939-968. See pages 138-45 of the Legislative

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