

May 22, 1981

LB 472A

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I would just ask Senator Hoagland, who is the introducer of 472A, if you have been asked to reconsider it, if you have been taken into account on this decision, whether there is anything in 472A that should be reconsidered, if there is any reason to reconsider it? Could you reiterate why you asked it to be withdrawn and state whether or not there is any necessity for the bill whatsoever at this point in time?

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Mr. Speaker and colleagues, in response to Senator Beutler's question, I have been informed that an attempt would be made to use this bill, which has been withdrawn by this body and which I was a sponsor of before it was withdrawn, as a vehicle for this. I have not consented to it, not that that is relevant. Now the reason we withdrew this bill is because when this Legislature yesterday passed the risk management bill, which we are assuming the Governor will sign, it obviated the necessity of 472A. 472A became unneeded and that is why I asked the body this morning to suspend the rules and permit the bill be withdrawn all at the same time, which we did by a vote of 34 to nothing. Does that answer your question, Senator Beutler?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I think we should at least...it seems to me that there are two things that make a lot of sense with regard to denying this motion to reconsider. In the first place, there is nothing to reconsider. The bill is completely not needed. And, secondly, at least to date in this body, I think we have generally respected the wishes of the introducer and not put extraneous amendments on bills that are going to carry somebody's name unless they approve of that. So I would ask you to consider those two things.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Vickers.

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. President, members, I just rise to remind you of the rule change that I offered this body yesterday afternoon. I pointed out to you a little over twenty-four hours ago that reconsideration motions on bills that have once got to Final Reading in the last five days of this session were just going to take up a lot of time. We were going to wind up with four stages of debate instead of three and that I, personally, was not going to vote for any reconsideration motions, even though there were some bills that were on reconsideration, that had reconsiderations piled on them that I was personally in favor of, and there was one bill that we had already passed that I would have liked to have got back and left back. I just think we