

like the fact that this bill will be destroyed, even though it is of minor importance but I do feel that if we are to carry out our responsibility of this state we had best act on this bankruptcy issue. You can put the blame where you wish.

PRESIDENT: Chair recognizes Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I guess I should say that the language in LB 940 or that language sought to be included in LB 940 is largely my language. The levels at which the exemptions are raised to, \$2,500 in the case of personal property; \$6,500 in the case of homestead exemptions; and the closing of the life insurance loophole are in essence language that I asked the committee to prepare and to add to LB 901, the original phantom from which the bankruptcy issue began. I a..in the event the amendment is attached to the bill, I'll vote for 940 because I think that it is language that I can live with and probably is realistic. The difficulty here is and however a genuine one, it puts me in a difficult bind. For example, throughout the course of the consideration on this issue I received a number of very interesting long well thought out issues and arguments brought out by legal aid societies and the like. It is because I have been on the committee I think. Probably the rest of you haven't had these letters. You probably haven't been contacted by the Legal Aid Society in Omaha, the Western Nebraska Legal Services in North Platte, Nebraska with long six and seven page letters discussing intricately the workings of the federal bankruptcy act, and why haven't you. Well, it hasn't been out on the floor. We don't have a clear public record that this issue is before the legislature. Why not? Well as far as anyone can tell who looks at the process, this issue is still in the committee, LB 901 is still in the Banking Committee. There is no way for the public to know that we are dealing with this issue, which is why perhaps the banking groups can get to you, perhaps the Savings and Loans can get to you, perhaps those who have a paid lobbyist can get to you and talk to you about the value of LB 901, but the people who might have an interest in opposing it can't tell you that because they don't have a lobbyist out here and they can't tell you the intricacies of the legislative process. Well now that is the problem, isn't it. The problem is whether or not the procedure you follow has a substantive role to play in your law making. I'm going to tell you that I think it does. You know when we enacted the Unicameral system in 1935, when we went to a one house legislature we invented a process. It is absolutely new. If you go to a bicameral state, we vote once if we were a Senate or a House of Representatives. We would vote on this