

January 14, 1982

LB 378

I see no reason for the Public Health and Welfare Committee to again hold another public hearing on LB 378 as it has been amended. There is sufficient time in this legislative session for us to debate and discuss this issue. I have not tried to stifle debate or to shut it off or to prevent anyone from expressing their opinion or asking questions. I am happy and more than willing and encourage anyone who wants to discuss it with me or anyone else to sit down between now and Select File and discuss it again. We have many issues to deal with in this session of the Legislature. A public hearing on this issue would only slow it down by a few weeks and I see no reason for us to do that. I urge you to reject Senator Wesely's attempt to send this bill back to committee for public hearing.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I want to rise and talk just about the issue of public hearing and public notice and I remind you that we have been talking about this on a number of occasions recently at the end of last session and the beginning of this session and we have no policy whatsoever. Apparently the policy is if the bill has got 25 votes we can throw out any consideration of public notice, and if it doesn't have 25 votes, then we will start talking about whether we need to have public hearings. You might remember at the end of the session last year, we had LB 472A, no public hearing. We amended it on Final Reading. This year we went back over the same material, we sent it back for public hearing, didn't understand the policy to begin with, ultimately we return to the idea that major amendments need hearings. That is what finally won in 472A. End of last year we changed by some amendments that I offered the veterans disability homestead exemption, did it on Select File. Comes Final Reading time, objections are made by the introducers, says this is new material, we should take this off, there hasn't been a public hearing. The body agreed. I was chastised for that amendment and probably properly so. The amendment was stripped off. The bill went on because those amendments didn't have a public hearing. The body so far in those two instances are consistent. We had the Urban Affairs looking at LB 359 on SIDs earlier this year. Amendments were offered on General File. Senator Fenger objected. We hadn't seen those in hearings. There were others on the floor who objected. We sent it back to a hearing in the Urban Affairs Committee. Those amendments have had a hearing. They are now being reported out to the floor. Substantial amendments, the rule was there should be a hearing. This body only several days ago changed a bill to create four new crimes

6748