

be paying these and I think this is substantive enough that it should be held in a hearing, should be advertised and the people in the state and other entities be heard on the matter. It isn't an earthshaking matter whether we cut out one book-keeping step but I really do think that this body should have an opportunity and the committee that held the hearing in the first place should be able to hold the hearing again in the second place and to decide for themselves whether they think the thing ought to be brought up on this bill. Why wasn't this bill brought up on its own prior to the time running out? Simply perhaps because it wasn't thought of. Now if there is another bill running through here somewhere that we don't know about, why didn't Senator Johnson throw it in? He knew what the situation was. Senator Chambers knew darn well what the situation is. No bill there that I know of. Maybe there is but why attach it to something as an insignificant amendment? Senator Vard Johnson, I have heard you criticize us for putting an amendment on. Oh, I will take it back. Maybe you haven't but at least somebody has done so in the past but I really think that we should refer this back to the Government Committee where it was in the first place for a hearing on these two substantive measures.

SPEAKER MARVEL: We are still speaking on the motion to rerefer the bill. Senator Koch.

SENATOR KOCH: Mr. Speaker, a question of Senator Nichol if he would yield.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Nichol.

SENATOR KOCH: Senator Nichol, I had my button on earlier and the question you just brought up is the question I wanted to ask. Approximately how much money do we presently collect from fines that support the Law Enforcement Center at Grand Island?

SENATOR NICHOL: Senator Koch, I don't have the slightest idea. The bill had nothing to do with the amount of money being handled, therefore, I did not pay any attention to how much money would be handled. The amendment didn't show up in the book until this morning.

SENATOR KOCH: Well I will tell you the reason I supported the amendment was that during the course of explanation and discussion Senator Chambers said that the bill should then properly be referred back to the committee for a hearing since there is a major change and I understand the burden of time but I would suggest to this body that unless we take that bill back to the Government Committee again for a re-hearing since we have changed it substantially in terms of