

April 1, 1981

LB 5

job for the peoples of Nebraska.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I am opposed to this bill as I have been opposed to attempts to abolish Final Reading in the past. Senator Beutler's suggestion that an outline or an explanation might take the place of Final Reading I think has an infirmity, Senator Beutler, because as with 205 sometimes the person who drafts the bill doesn't really understand the significance of the words used, so somebody putting together an outline or a summary might really intend to convey the notion of what he or she thinks the bill means but the words that are actually used are the ones that would be viewed by a court or whoever is to come into contact with that law. So I don't think that would be an adequate solution. And I would disagree with Senator Marsh about not being able to gain anything while a lengthy bill is being read. There was one last year I think related to the power of eminent domain and a word like "useful" rather than "necessary" was in the bill, and I amended that word out, and the body agreed. But nobody else had made that motion. So it means if the bill were not being read on Final Reading, I would not have caught that because I hadn't studied that bill prior to its reading. And apparently other members of the body either had not read it or they were content to let it go through even though they disagreed with it. So there are some of us who will read these bills on Final Reading, and I am one of those people who frankly will acknowledge that many bills get no reading from me until Final Reading. If the bill were not to be read, I would have to try to get the schedule in advance and see which bills are coming up and if there were lengthy bills and I thought that I had some objections, I would have to prepare a number of frivolous motions to engender discussion and debate on Final Reading to give me time to analyze the portion that I may genuinely be concerned about. And then if I felt that there was enough concern, I would make an appropriate motion to return the bill. But I think time may in the long run be saved by keeping Final Reading just as it is. I am not one of those who would go for a tradition simply because it has been around for a long time, but this Final Reading time has been shown to carry benefits to the body, even on LB 205. People, I guess, who thought that they understood that bill and would have voted to pass it on this morning after the discussion, changed their mind and adopted certain amendments. So, there will be burdens connected with any procedure that