

on General File. An objection was made. This is new language, a substantial amendment. We relied on the rule that says substantial amendments require a hearing. The Speaker is in a position to send it back. If we wish, we move for that. The body said no, not substantial enough of an amendment. You add all that up, we have got a patchwork quilt. Some days we believe in public notice, some days we believe in public hearings, and some days we don't. What is today? This is Thursday the 14th. I guess it will be a flip of the coin as to whether or not we really believe in holding public hearings today. I will be interested in the body and its mood on whether or not we believe in the idea that substantial changes in our laws require consulting the public. I wonder exactly what our temperature is on that. Personally I have always tried to hew the line on one side of the question. Substantial amendments require public notice and public hearing. I hope the body believes in that idea. It is an important one. I don't think that we can assume as we do that the public knows the law without giving them the opportunity to react to a law. You know when there is a crime and an individual is hauled up before the courts, he doesn't get to say, "Oh, I didn't know it was a crime", and why not, because we have an open policy, an open procedure at the arrival of laws. We assume public knowledge of the law and that is as unrealistic an assumption as the law ever makes but we do it so that criminal justice can proceed. Well, that is what is happening here. If we really believe that the public has a role to play, if we are going to make a change like this, we ought to give them a chance to tell us what they thing about it in the form of a public hearing, and I think even though I am a critic of LB 378, I arise to object to the procedure on a different basis. I would object to this procedure even if I was in favor of the bill.

SENATOR CLARK: You have one minute left.

SENATOR LANDIS: And I hope the body will act in a propitious and sensible way on these amendments and give them back to a committee to have a public hearing on and consult the public, and hopefully this will not be seen as a dilatory action. If there is a majority, it should be enacted into law but that majority should not act without referring this to a public hearing and consulting the public for their thoughts on the measure.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Barrett.

SENATOR BARRETT: I move the previous question.