

March 29, 1973

PRESIDENT: Senator Luedtke do you care to respond?

SENATOR LUEDTKE: Mr. President and members of the legislature, Senator Murphy, that is the very idea of our accountability in Nebraska to have a hearing on every bill, because many times when we get to a hearing, when we listen to the people we find out that the bill that we proposed, somebody proposed isn't the kind of a bill that will work, and we have people come in and say now you got to change this and you got to change that, and then you do as was in this case, there is a considerable amendment, considerable amendments, but I can assure you that they were to make the procedures more easily understandable when they get out here, in other words, if you inserted all these in the bill itself, it would have been terribly confusing. The simplest way is to do just what they did in this case, and that's the result of our committee system.

SENATOR MURPHY: If I may Senator, when this bill was set for hearing, we had a room packed with people who came to attend the hearing on this bill, when the committee amendment, when the proposers, not the committee, not the changes made in committee, but the proposers amendments were introduced at the beginning of the hearing, the room emptied out and everyone went home. The people might, the people who might have wanted to appear against the bill that we finally heard, could have no knowledge of it, because the bill had not been in print. I'm saying that when we get a bill that is so diverse from the initial published intent, that the both the proponents and opponents of this bill can be entirely misled on what is going to happen if in fact, the proponent amends that bill drastically before it is ever heard in committee.

SENATOR LUEDTKE: Well Senator, wasn't it done in the presence of those opponents and proponents present at the committee?

SENATOR MURPHY: Yes it did, -

SENATOR LUEDTKE: Didn't they know what was going on?

SENATOR MURPHY: Not until they arrived.

SENATOR LUEDTKE: Well they were there though.

SENATOR MURPHY: They were there, but neither they nor the committee were aware of what was going to be presented, because it had been altered so considerably. I'm saying, I grant you that committee amendments in the presence of people who are there to hear a specific subject certainly are proper, but to me a bill amended completely out of sight so that people who might have wanted to appear against what the bill really set forth when we heard it, had no opportunity to appear for or against.

SENATOR LUEDTKE: You see what happens, many times is, that the objections are all met by the amendments and people empty out of the room, because they no objection, I don't know whether this was true here.

SENATOR MURPHY: Well may I say this, principally the people who were there to hear this bill were there to hear two clauses that had been admitted after the bill had been printed, after the committee hearing had been set, so really the people who came, purportedly to hear this argument, the argument was not there, and it was known in advance.

SENATOR LUEDTKE: If I may just, I don't want to quibble about the matter, but in answer to, I think if we did follow what you are suggesting, and did it with everytime there was any substantial amendment, we would continue to have hearings right up to the last day we met in this body, that wouldn't work either, maybe something in between is necessary, I'll grant you.