

February 22, 1980

LB 680

the provisions for eminent domain indirectly here or otherwise I assume that you had no basis for eminent domain unless it was for a public purpose in the first place. I don't quite understand why that whole provision is in there.

SENATOR NICHOL: The purpose is not to change the meaning of the bill, Senator Warner. The only purpose is to clarify it with more legal wordage rather than something that is not legal in nature such as the word "necessity". As I understand the legal department, it says this would be better than to use more layman words but I promise you the purpose was not to change the meaning of the bill.

SENATOR WARNER: Okay.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Reutzel.

SENATOR REUTZEL: Senator Nichol, this deals with eminent domain?

SENATOR NICHOL: Pardon me?

SENATOR REUTZEL: The bill deals with eminent domain? You mentioned that in the... Is that the eminent domain which is not included in LB 653? I was just curious.

SENATOR NICHOL: I don't think so.

SENATOR REUTZEL: Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Schmit, do you wish to make any comments on the committee amendments?

SENATOR SCHMIT: I have no comments, Mr. Chairman. I believe the question by Senator Warner resolved it.

SPEAKER MARVEL: All right, the motion is the adoption of the committee amendments to LB 680. All those in favor of that motion vote aye, opposed no. Have you all voted? We are voting on the committee amendments to LB 680. Record.

CLERK: 26 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on the adoption of the committee amendments.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion is carried. The amendments are adopted. Senator Schmit, do you have some amendments to the bill?

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President, I do have an amendment that was printed on page 692 of the Journal which I am going to