

March 7, 1979

SENATOR DWORAK: ...sixty day deadline. That also complicates the problem. We just absolutely do not have the time to deliberate, to put together these matters, and so when we start restricting farther, we're only complicating greater, so the answer is not restrictions, the answer is the other direction. So I think it's time we stopped kidding the body, stopped going home and saying, yah, there are too many bills introduced, yah, we should meet every ten years, and all the other trite statements that have been brought up over and over again that's very popular, and face the issue and give it...let the public know the truth. Let them know the time restrictions we're working under. Let's quit kidding them. I think that...and I think this particular measure only...only perpetuates that falsehood that we're purporting now to the public with this type of legislation, or rule change.

SENATOR NICHOL: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, every year we have the discussion on limiting bills, and I wonder if maybe we're not approaching it from the entirely wrong direction. Now the reason we want to do this is because we pick up the Public Pulse and we see the editorials, and it says too many bills, they're not handling things right, not processing things right. Maybe our problem has been we haven't gone out and educated the public on this particular subject, and Nebraska is unique on bills in the Legislature. So let's... let's just discuss for a minute how we're unique. Well, first of all, we have a Constitution that a hundred or so years ago our forefathers decided we're going to be a little cagey, we're going to make sure that they don't take four or five or six, or a dozen different ideas, put them all into one bill, and let things slip through without us having a chance to check it out. So they said only one subject in a bill. Do you want to change a comma? Do you want to update a name? Do you want to do anything? You've got to have a separate bill. And then what else? We have a separate hearing...a public hearing. What's the benefit of all this? Well, in a Unicameral, when you only have one House that's watching over things, it means that the public has a shot at examining everything in detail, every new little idea that ever comes up. Nothing is allowed to sneak through without being subject to public scrutiny. Now what are they avoiding? Well, everybody remembers reading the World Herald and the Lincoln papers about the defense bill in Congress. It had a rider put on it today to build a new multi-jillion dollar hospital over in Afghanistan and then another rider to build a this or that in Senator so and so's district. The way the Congress works, they take a major subject like the defense bill, or the HEW bill, and then everybody