

be verbally reminded of what is in the bill. I think that that would be a marked improvement. It would save the enormous amount of time, like we have, I know we're having, hopefully, LB 76 sometime will be read on Final Reading this year, a 400-page bill. Sorry, Senator Janssen. Senator Kristensen's bill last year where hardly get the bill read in a full day. It would deal with those types of issues, so we would not be dealing with all of that time. But, by the same token, it would provide a final analysis of a bill by members of the Legislature. Let me respond to what I assume will be the red herring drug across the trail of this bill, because it's already been brought up a little bit, the question of who will write the summaries and what kind of abuse of the system might take place once we have that in place. First of all, I would say I cannot imagine a bigger abuse of the system, abuse of what the founders of our government contemplated than the way we deal with Final Reading at this point. So I would point out that, yes, it is possible that anything we put in the Constitution could, in fact, be abused. But what I would assume, if I...and, again, if I were part of the Rules Committee or the body making the rules on how to implement the summary provisions, I would contemplate a system whereby the bill summaries that are in our book would be updated, probably by the committee counsel to reflect whatever amendments had taken place, and that would contemplate...constitute the summary. Now I've been in the body a while and I know that most members in the body, from time to time, rely quite heavily on the committee statements. When I put together the consent calendar, when I want to know what a bill does or doesn't do, that's what I use are the committee statements. Yes, it's possible that the committee clerks could be...or committee counsels could be miswriting those statements. They could be subjected to pressure and not put everything into it. All the time I've been in the body I've never heard, I have never heard a criticism of one of these bill summaries as being jaded one way or the other, tilted one way or the other in its explanation. I think that they would be handled quite well. The precedent is there with all of these items that we currently rely upon. We rely upon most of the information, particularly those of us not trained in the law and reading statutory provisions rely almost exclusively on summarizations as today. I see no problem with that. I assume that we'll now hear the people that don't want this amendment, or don't want to see LR 15 to advance will talk about all the potential misuses in it. But I want to say, up front, I don't see that as a major problem. I think that this is a measure that would be a middle