

cost the city very much. These legal notices are minimal costs but it always surprises me as to how strong the newspaper will fight for such minimal costs. If the costs are so minimal why are they so indignant when somebody tries to eliminate one of the legal notices that hardly anybody ever reads anyway? I think the committee amendments are unnecessary. I realize I am fighting a losing battle because of the power of the press and the fear that many of us have of them but the fact is, these people are going to be notified. The people that are paying the bill are going to get a first class letter. There is no need, absolutely no need, that I can see to insist on having this published in the newspaper and I oppose the committee amendments.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Vard Johnson.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I was just going to ask Senator Landis a question on this.

PRESIDENT: Senator Landis, will you respond?

SENATOR LANDIS: Certainly.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Senator Landis, as the committee chairman, I think you were probably honor bound and duty bound to at least advance on the floor the amendment, the committee amendment to LB 31 but you indicated that you had some misgivings about the amendment itself and, in fact, voted against the amendment. Could you explain to the body and to me what your misgivings were?

SENATOR LANDIS: Yes, Senator Johnson. I think the notice that Senator Vickers offers, the idea of a direct mailing to those citizens directly affected is not only probably the most cost efficient but also the best kind of notice that could be given. It is certainly superior to a published notice because I think it will be read and I think it will adequately serve the needs that exist for adequate notice prior to the creation of such a district. I do also indicate that I see little reason for a second kind of notice which will be costly which will require expenditures of tax dollars for a remote value. Perhaps you can recall two years ago, Senator Johnson, when we argued the legal notice requirements in probate proceedings. We have repeatedly come across the issue in the Government Committee of published notice and there seems to be a clear political current by the Press Association and others to defend any and every published legal notice regardless of its value. I think this is a notice of little value right now. It is being replaced by a superior notice that will