

one place. The precedent you are being asked to reverse, and I say that and expressing to you the information that, since 67 all of the substantial legislation that has been changed relating to the intricacies of county and city planning legislation have come from one source--Government, Military and Veterans Affairs, none have come from the Agriculture and Environment Committee. Then what is the precedent that is being established here today if you reject the reference recommendations of the Executive Board? I would also say to you that I did not go to Jack Rogers this year, the previous year, or two years ago to influence the decision. To my knowledge no one else did. He assigned county matters to a committee that deals with county matters--that's it.

PRESIDENT: Your time is up, Senator. Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, members of the Legislature. This is going to be a difficult talk because you see Senator Schmit and I know in advance that we're going to lose this vote. So we're doing this merely, I think, on really honestly moral grounds. Some of the things I'm going to say are going to be very painful. LB 56, the bill that we're dealing with, is my bill. I did take the appeal to the Executive Board. LB 56 is a land use bill. I want to tell you about LB 55. LB 55 is something we're not discussing, but maybe we really are. LB 55 is a constitutional amendment dealing with water. LB 55 was assigned to the Public Works Committee. I wish some of you would listen that are laughing because the precedent that you set here this morning is going to live with you this year, next year and a lot of years in the future. The precedent that the Executive Board ties itself to here could, one day, haunt them. Their precedent on LB 55, the standard that they use as I went to every one of them, individually and asked them "Why did LB 55, a clear-cut constitutional amendment, go to Public Works?" The standard they told me was "Because we feel LB 55, dealing with water, should go there because that Committee has done the study, they have the expertise, they have done the work in the area, they are the ones that have held the hearings over the last several years. That is the standard we used". I said then "On 56 what was the standard? Because the Agriculture Committee is the one that has held the hearings, has the volumes of expertise, whether our Harvard graduates think so or not, they are the ones that have been assigned the bills even after floor debate for four years. What standard was used there?" The members of the Executive Board told me, one after another, "Duh, we don't know". Then, finally, I did get one member of the Executive Board, who was flat honest with me. We established a confidence that I wouldn't say who he was and he told me why. Why did they completely abolish the standard on 56 that they had set on 55? That member told me, he said, "Well look, I was just fed up with Schmit having too much power in here. I don't like to see any member get a lot of power, and I guess I was just fed up. Yes, it was probably wrong, but that is why". Well if those are the kind of standards we're going to begin using in our voting on bills then you're going to have hell to pay before the end of the session because you aren't going to make everybody and every other member of this Legislature happy a hundred percent of the time. You're going to be mad at somebody after breakfast one morning, and if you come up here and then vote against the bill they have, the issue which involves all the people of the state, because you happen to have a hard feeling against one