

announced and people in the audience are prepared to testify for or against the matter. But first the Senator who introduced the bill asked the committee to recommend amendments when it sends the bill to the entire legislature. The hearing then proceeds, not on the original bill, but on the sponsor's recommended version. The upshot on at least three recent occasions has been grumbling. Senators have said they don't like being taken by surprise by such tactics. The tactic also has been criticized by people who plan to testify on the original bill but said they were unprepared to react to the amendments. But the practice is not forbidden by legislative rules. Even one of its most vocal critics South Sioux City Senator John Murphy said Monday, it is a necessary part of the legislative process. "We certainly can't eliminate the process of amending bills at public hearings". Murphy said, "But when you yank the table cloth away and offer an entirely new place setting that is something else again", he said. Last week when Murphy perceived that to be happening he left a public hearing in protest. Earlier this month, however, Murphy was criticized by several lobbyists when he offered a rewritten version of one of his bills for testimony at a public hearing. Murphy said the difference between the two incidents illustrates complexity of the issues. His walk out came out on Omaha Senator David Newell's attempt to address an antitrust provision in a bill originally dealing with deceptive advertising. Murphy charged that Newell's attempt conflicted with legislative rules that prohibit changing the subject matter of a bill. Joining Murphy in objecting to Newell's amendment were Omaha Senators Neal Simon and Tom Fitzgerald who said they didn't believe the amendment should have been proposed unless the public had a chance to learn of its contents before the hearing. Newell later endorsed a second hearing on the matter. Murphy said earlier criticism directed at him was a different matter. That came during a Judiciary Committee hearing on Murphy's LB 86, guaranteeing public access to public, I mean to official records. He said the rewritten bill he proposed at the hearing incorporated amendments drafted, drafted in cooperation with opponents of the measure who had been given a chance to participate in drawing up the amendments. They had every chance to participate he said. Senator Murphy, I would like to ask you a question.

PRESIDENT: Senator Murphy, will you respond?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: On this amendment that is being offered to this bill, have the opponents to the merits of the amendment been contacted to see if they agreed with this