

I think that in all fairness it was very unusual to close debate on this issue at this time. It is most unlikely that Senator Bereuter would have proposed it because Senator Bereuter has always been extremely fair in these issues and I am surprised that he would do so. To imply that the issue is not important or that it will be easily resolved or that it will be resolved here this morning is certainly a misnomer. The issue will not be resolved here this morning, irregardless of whether you vote to send the bills to Government and Military Affairs or whether you send them to Agriculture and Environment. The issue is going to be with us for a long time. I would suggest that many people who would have spoken on this issue are being denied the opportunity to speak this morning and I would suggest that perhaps those individuals who do not want the bills to go to Ag and Environment are anxious to close off debate because they know that if the issues are fully explored there can be no possible conclusion but that the bills belong with the Agriculture and Environment Committee. There are many reasons that I could enumerate at this time but I will not do so. I think that the issue most important here this morning is consistency, sincerity and honesty of this body and I say in all fairness, I have made many speeches on this floor. I do not challenge and I have never challenged the honesty or integrity of any member of this body. I have stated openly and to the press and on this floor that the bills will receive a fair hearing irregardless of which committee hears the bills. I would suggest also that I have no concern about my own ability to work with the bills on the floor if they arrive there. I would like to remind you that there are members in this body who would not be here, perhaps, if it had not been for the fact that two years ago these bills became law. They became law in the form which many people now agree went way too far. That is why there are three bills introduced here today. You know, in some instances it is very ironic. I am being portrayed as being against these bills. I am for the bills because they reverse the trend that was established two years ago, the trend that so many of us were unable to point to you was wrong and you gave the State Office of Planning and Programming authority way beyond and above that which they should have. I am not going to argue about the mechanics, the various reasons. Senator Mills gave you some reasons as to why the bills went to Public Works when they might have gone to Constitutional Revision. There are good reasons why bills can be assigned to more than one committee, and the fact that the Executive Board or the Reference Committee did as they did is proof of that fact. Senator Marvel has pointed out that the bills could have gone to several committees. No one denies that. The overlying fact is this. The time will come, ladies and gentlemen, when all of us realize that there are points of no return. If I were to go to Omaha, Nebraska, spread my blanket over the lawn of Senator Simon and invite my ten children in to have a picnic, I am sure there would be repercussions, yet every year from Valparaiso to Bellwood, Nebraska I am inundated by individuals who trespass on the land, who hunt over the property, perch in the trees to shoot deer with bow and arrow, fish in the ponds, leave the gates open. I have never posted a farm opposed to hunting.

PRESIDENT: One minute.