

March 31, 1981

LB 40, 181, 284A, 437

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, I urge you to advance the bill. It is of course the money aspect of this thing and I would just say on Select File as Senator Cal Carsten pointed out, we have to decide on the numbers and that may be \$70,000,000. It may be \$71,000,000, 72.5, I don't know. But I think all of you people that feel very strongly one way or another, we should sit down here in the next twenty-four to forty-eight hours and see if we can't reach a consensus of just what kind of numbers you want to put in here.

SENATOR CLARK: The question before the House is the advancement of LB 284A. All those in favor vote aye. All those opposed vote nay.

CLERK: Senator Clark voting aye.

SENATOR CLARK: Have you all voted on the advancement of 284A? Record the vote.

CLERK: 33 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on the motion to advance the A bill.

Mr. President, Senator Labeledz offers explanation of vote.

I have a new resolution signed by the membership, LR 50. (Read LR 50 as found on pages 1224-1225 of the Legislative Journal.) That will be laid over, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I have an Attorney General's opinion addressed to Senator Marsh. That will be inserted in the Journal. (See pages 1225-1226 of the Journal.)

Mr. President, Senator Cullan would like to print amendments to LB 437; Senator Wesely to print amendments to LB 181. (See page 1227 of the Journal.)

Mr. President, LB 40 was a bill introduced by Senators Goodrich, Koch and DeCamp. (Title read.) The bill was first read on January 8. It was referred to Revenue. The membership considered the bill on March 23. At that time committee amendments were adopted, Mr. President. On a motion the bill failed to advance on March 23. I now have an amendment from Senator DeCamp to strike the committee amendments as adopted.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, the only reason I suggest we strike the committee amendments is because they proposed this be on the ballot as I understand it, in May in Omaha and that now is a technical and legal impossibility. So I am suggesting we strike those amendments and then I would hope that maybe in light of the