

February 23, 1996 LB 948

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Pirsch. Discussion on the Pirsch amendment? Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Crosby, members of the Legislature, I don't know how to approach a particular amendment like this. We're talking about a bill that's 75 pages and committee amendments that are 15 pages, something that changes 128 sections of law, and we're on Final Reading. There's a lot of material to look at in a bill like this. I don't know if the Legislature wants to start in on this kind of process so early in the session. I assume this is a consent bill, is it not, Senator Pirsch? It is on the consent calendar. This is the second consent calendar bill that we've taken already and advanced above other consent calendar bills simply because I assume we're all worried about getting bills passed. But I have rarely in my experience seen an amendment of this volume attempted to be attached by bringing a bill back from Final Reading. If...we're a one-house Legislature, if we're not going to have three rounds of debate I think it seriously impairs our ability to deliberatively look at things. If we're not going to have two rounds of debate, I think it impairs it even more seriously. If we're only going to have one round of debate on a bill that amends 128 sections and involves 90 pages of reading, and it's already on consent calendar, I guess I would suggest that it be left on consent calendar. If it's really, everybody has agreed to it, if it truly in fact is noncontroversial it should pass on consent calendar. If it's...but at the very least, if it were on consent calendar there would be three opportunities to look at it. It would be a bill that would get a little bit of scrutiny, anyway. This process, and I appreciate why you're doing it, Senator Pirsch. I can see all kinds of other people trying to do similar things very shortly here, but this is not germane. This is not a good way of processing bills. I hope you will think very seriously about what we're doing. If this is the process we're going to use, then there will be no arguments any where now down the line, on anything anybody wants to do, because, one, this is not germane, I don't think, under anybody's concept of germaneness, and, two, it's a huge bill and it's Final Reading. And if you're going to do this then I think we all should just note it as the way the session's going to go this year. We're going to Christmas-tree anything and everything out there, and he who raises the germaneness argument and votes for this is not going to come in with clear hands. I suggest that we just not do this, let it