

April 1, 1981

LB 40

of people as possible to get input. I am not conceited enough to think that I don't need some suggestions and advice.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, it's going to be my unpleasant duty again to strip away all of the things that are appearing to be said that really aren't touching the issue, and say that there is a lot of political maneuvering connected with all three of these bills. And LB 40 was given two hearings and a distinction between LB 40 and those other bills is that LB 40 was given a vote and it failed to advance. Now, I checked to see if LB 284... 245 had failed, and it had not failed to advance. And if you want to check the Journal, on page 1075 you will see that LB 40 was given a vote and it did not advance and that distinguishes it from these other bills. And if others won't say why these arrangements are being made, I will say it. Were this not the bill for the Omaha sales tax and were it not tied in with deals on these other two bills, it would not have come up yesterday right behind the two of them and it would not be given a second hearing or a third one today. Now if the Speaker is really trying to be fair, what is going to have to be done is to revamp this whole system, do away with the priority bills as they exist now, including 40, and none of them that have been considered should be considered. And we should put all of the bills, their numbers, in a bowl and draw them out, and say we will not deviate from the order in which those numbers are drawn from the bowl, we will not allow any second hearings unless a bill goes to the bottom and comes up in the natural order. But when we piecemeal in this fashion, we get ad hoc decisions. Judgments are taken that the body has no awareness of until it is sprung on them at the last minute, it makes the whole system seem arbitrary and unpredictable, and that can never create a system of fairness. And one other thing, now there could not be to my way of thinking a fair way to establish a precedent for one highly political bill and after it's handled, then draw a line and say, no other bill gets that consideration. Every bill on second hearing ought to have unlimited discussion in the same way LB 40 did because LB 40 failed to advance, and now it has a second hearing, then a third one, and yet any other bill that is on second hearing will be limited to 30 minutes. And maybe after this few that are there now for a second hearing will get their 30 minutes, then any bill that doesn't move the first time will go to the bottom. Is that what the rule is? I don't even know. So when you have a system that you can put together on the spur of the moment, you can make it anything you want it to be.