

February 4, 1980

LB 696

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Vickers, do you wish to speak to the motion to send the bill back to the Committee?

SENATOR VICKERS: Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and fellow members, I'd like to ask Senator Nichol a question, if I may.

SENATOR NICHOL: Yes, sir.

SENATOR VICKERS: Senator Nichol, I notice this bill, 696, was introduced as a committee bill, isn't that correct?

SENATOR NICHOL: Yes, that is right.

SENATOR VICKERS: If the committee had had hearings and the interim studies and so forth as has been presented here on the amended version of 696, why didn't the committee simply introduce a bill written as the amended version of 696 is to start with?

SENATOR NICHOL: Senator Vickers, some portions of this bill, especially the amendments, did not have specific hearings having to do with this specific bill. Now we have had hearings on these matters at various times but not particularly on this bill, especially the amendment.

SENATOR VICKERS: That is the question I asked, why didn't you introduce a bill if the committee chose to have a bill like 696 as being amended, why didn't they introduce a bill as drafted that way?

SENATOR NICHOL: As I said earlier when I presented the amendments, we do this each year with fallacies in previous bills or fallacies in the law prior, that we have a catchall bill and we put these things in. It is not done with the intent of hiding anything from you or not having a hearing, and as I tried to alert you in my opening statements, there are some things here that you should have a look at.

SENATOR VICKERS: Okay, thank you, Senator Nichol. I apologize. I wasn't listening that close in the opening statement I guess. It almost slipped by me. I would rise to support Senator Wesely in his motion to send it back to committee because I notice at the hearing there was only one proponent and that was Mr. Goc for the committee, no opponents and, undoubtedly, it was a very noncontroversial piece of legislation that you were hearing as far as the public was concerned, and I would submit that if the bill had been introduced as it is attempting to be amended, it might have had