Senator Fowler would like to print amendments to LB 387. (See page 142 of the Journal.)

Senator Warner would like to print amendments to LB 198. Senator Landis to 180 and 180A. (See page 143 of the Journal).

Mr. President, two new bills. LB 687 offered by Senators Haberman, Nichol, Kahle and VonMinden. (Read title). LB 688 offered by Senators Fowler, Landis and Wesely. (Read title). LB 689 offered by the Miscellaneous Subjects Committee and signed by its members. (Read title). (See page 144 of the Legislative Journal).

SPEAKER MARVEL: Next take up LB 359.

CLERK: Mr. President, LB 359 was a bill introduced by Senator Newell. (Read title). The bill was introduced on January 19 of last year. At that time it was referred to the Urban Affairs Committee for public hearing. The bill was advanced to General File. There are committee amendments pending by the Urban Affairs Committee, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The Chair recognizes Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I am not sure how to proceed procedurally and would ask the opinion of the Chair. There is before the Clerk a substitute amendment which would, in effect, gut all of 359, at least as it is written, and rewrites much of the same provisions placing all responsibility for elections rather than with the SID as it is now currently with the Election Commissioner. Much of what was to be accomplished by the committee amendments and the terms of LB 359 would be accomplished under this substitute amendment but ultimate responsibility would be shifted, and I think since that is what the introducers want to approach now, I would ask that we not handle the committee amendments at this time but proceed to the substitute amendment and since that is in effect the LB 259 incarnation that the introducers want to talk about perhaps we should pass over the committee amendments at this time.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Nichol, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR NICHOL: Mr. Chairman, I was going to suggest to Senator Landis that perhaps since they have changed the bill considerably they might wish to take it back for another hearing. I notice it changes it substantially, whatever that means and I wonder if you would consider that,