

January 17, 1995 LB 426-477  
LR 27-29

CLERK: Madam President, a record vote. (Read record vote. See pages 289-90 of the Legislative Journal.) 26 ayes, 7 nays, Madam President, on the adoption of rules amendment 13.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: The proposed rule change, number 13, is adopted. Mr. Clerk, do you have matters for the record?

CLERK: I do, Madam President. New bills, with your indulgence. New resolution, (read brief summary or LR 27-29. See pages 290-94 of the Legislative Journal.) New bills. (Read LB 426-477 for the first time by title. See pages 294-304 of the Legislative Journal.)

In addition to those items, Madam President, some hearing notices from the Urban Affairs Committee, and from the Banking, Commerce and Insurance Committee, signed by the respective Chairs. And I have a request to...motion from Senator Landis to rerefer LB 102 to the Banking Committee. And, Madam President, a communication from the Speaker directing the Clerk to forward LR 28 to Reference Committee for referral to the appropriate Standing Committee for public hearing. That is all that I have at this time, Madam President.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. We return now to a discussion of proposed rule change, number 14. The Chair recognizes Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Madam President. This rule change, drafted and introduced by the Rules Committee, is to clarify the situation where a member might want to propose successive motions to adjourn or recess for delaying or dilatory purposes. This is an amendment to Rule 7, Section 9, and it is number 14 in the packet that was handed out earlier, and it simply adds the words that a motion to adjourn shall be in order except when a motion to adjourn or recess has just been defeated, and "or recess" are words that are added to the previous rule that we had. Then for clarification a sentence is added, "Successive motions to adjourn or recess are never in order for dilatory purposes." And, just quite simply I guess, it is to prevent the situation where one of us might not want to continue working on a matter, we might feel we don't have the votes here right at that particular time to support our position, so we move to adjourn. If that were defeated, theoretically, one could argue under our rules that we could come back immediately with a rule