

May 1, 1975

PRESIDENT: The question again is shall the request be made to the Governor to return the bill. Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I agree with Senator Chambers and Senator Bereuter that the bill has been discussed and had been discussed thoroughly. That's about as far as I agree with them. I think that I would say also that when the bill was discussed we kept our discussion to the bill. I very rarely, I think, become angry on this floor. I try to control my temper. I think that I have the right to resent the implication that is cast here this morning that there is something immoral, unethical, dirty, underhanded, or cheap about the motion to return this bill. I did not oppose the bill viciously, vigorously, or unhandedly on the floor. I voted against the bill on Final Reading. I don't think that anyone, if you will check the record, will find where I cast any aspersions on the integrity of Senator Bereuter for the introduction of the bill, or on Senator Chambers, or anyone else who voted for the bill. I think the bill, in my opinion, goes farther than most members realize that it does go. I did not, I have not, and I will not challenge the right of any member of this body to introduce any piece of legislation on the floor. At the same time, I think it is unrealistic for another member of this body to sit as an authority on any issue and to waive that authority like a flag before this body, before this city, this county, or the State of Nebraska. We have heard, many times, about various tactics on this floor. I want to say to you that I did not notice any bullying tactics. We have shoved bills back and forth across the board in one manner or another. Senator Moylan had a bill returned from . . . under the very nose of the Governor, snatched from victory. Three times it was read on Final Reading. Finally, in defeat it went down. I didn't hear Senator Moylan complaining about the fact that he wasn't accepted as a member of this body. I think all of us accept each other individual member. We accept them for what they are, for the fact that they represent their people. We all understand we were elected here by the people to do that which we think is best in the representation of those people. There was a news story which read, and I paraphrase the headline, that not necessarily do the Ag representatives best represent agricultural people. That was a quote from a member of this body. It didn't offend me. I know who best represents agricultural people. I admire and I respect the men from the rural and urban areas equally. Many times I have received support more vigorously from the urban interest than I have from my own rural people on issues that were of vital interest to me both agriculture and non-agricultural. I want to say this, I am amazed that on the floor of this body that within this state Legislature we are willing to place in the hands of one appointed individual, unlimited authority, unlimited in any degree . . . to any degree in the area of land use within a specific locality and area. The bill is limited. I agree. But we all know the bill is not just what it says it shall be. The office of Planning and Programming has extensive ideas. I have high regard for Mr. Nelson. I think he is one of the most capable men in