

April 28, 1983

LB 234, 579A

SPEAKER NICHOL: LB 579A with the emergency clause attached passes. Before we return to LB 234, may I announce that Senator Beyer has some guests under the south balcony that are very special to him, his son, Randy, and daughter-in-law, Kathy, and last and most important, his grandson, Mike. Do you think he is important? Luckily, he doesn't look like his grandfather. Mr. Clerk, do you have something for the record? I have been asked to announce, Mr. Clerk, before you do that, the Veterans Council dinner that was scheduled has been postponed until May 9th. So those of you that are planning to go to that, please be advised that the VFW dinner has been cancelled until May 9th. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, one item. I have a Lobby Registration Report for the week of April 21 through April 27th. (See page 1822 of the Journal.)

SPEAKER NICHOL: Back to LB 234. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, I have a series of motions with regards to LB 234. The first I have is offered by Senator Wiitala. Senator Wiitala would move to return the bill for a specific amendment. That amendment is found on page 1499 of the Journal.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Wiitala.

SENATOR WIITALA: Yes, Mr. Clerk, I would like to withdraw those amendments, if I may, and go with the ones that I submitted this morning.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Wiitala would move to return the bill for a specific amendment. The amendment is Request 1265. I believe, Senator, copies have been distributed to the membership.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Wiitala.

SENATOR WIITALA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I believe that you may have had some time available this morning to look over the materials that I passed out to you describing the need and necessity of returning LB 234 to Select File for specific amendments. This bill passed the Final Reading quite hurriedly because I think everyone at that time was in general agreement with all of its provisions. I think we understand what the issue is that it addresses. But I think largely because of the publicity that title washing has received, the bill has always been thought in terms of addressing the