

would deal with this sort of an issue but it is pretty clear I believe, and I think the body should be aware of it, that a game was played to get this bill to go to a specific committee, be treated in a specific manner. Now a specific amendment has been put on it for the expressed purpose of getting the bill to the floor so they can deny the amendments and have the bill out here, a way to get around, circumvent, if you will, the committee structure in this Unicameral and I oppose Senator DeCamp's motion to not accept the committee amendments. I think they should be accepted.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: Mr. President, I think Senator Vickers, who usually is fairly straightforward and honest, I think kind of misspoke the circumstances with regards to this legislation. I am going to rise to defend Senator DeCamp. As far as the first fact that the bill went to the Banking Committee, I don't think there was any games played there. I don't think that Senator Lamb and the Executive Board manipulated that bill there. The Banking Committee is the one that last year heard the energy bill. It is the committee that traditionally has taken this aspect of the energy question. Public Works has dealt with public power. But as far as energy legislation somehow being slipped over to Banking this year, that is simply not true and I think that is an attack on the integrity of Senator Lamb and the Executive Board and the referencing of bills this session. Senator Vickers, no games were being played with the referencing. In regards to Senator Nichol's statement that this should have a public hearing if it is changed, well, the original bill did have a public hearing. There would be no need, if the committee amendments are rejected, to send it back to committee for a hearing. There was such a hearing. Now it is the uranium question that came in with another bill and had a separate public hearing. If anything, it is the uranium issue that should be detached from this bill because that now is being considered before the Public Works Committee and has had a hearing. If we are going to look at that type of precedent, then we should reject the committee amendments which alter substantially this bill and go back to the original concept. Now I don't think it is an accident that those that have stood up and tried to talk about the integrity of the committee amendments are those who come from districts in the state where there are oil producing interests. I think that really is the basic question facing us with this bill. What is being presented is a bill to raise Nebraska's severance tax on oil and gas, one of the lowest in the nation, inadequately low, I would say. That issue is before us and those Senators that are standing up are not representing