

SPEAKER BAACK: Debate does not cease. The next speaker is Senator Bernard-Stevens. The call is raised.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body. I guess it's the amendment that will not go away. It's the amendment offered by Senator Lindsay and Senator Landis and the crux of the amendment that the body chooses to continue to discuss is whether or not we should gut the only part...the only amendment offered I think in good faith that would allow the body to move on to other issues and yet both sides be able to hold their heads high and, again, I reemphasize the points that there are many times in the body that we've been in the position where one side or another has used the rules or discussed and debated in a filibuster type of motion--Senator Schmit and others on certainly on the tax debate this year. Senator Rod Johnson I know currently has 30-some amendments filed on LB 72, if that would be brought up yet for discussion. There have been obviously times...times in the past that we've done so but each one of those particular issues were issues that could become law, would affect immediately people, would have far-reaching aspects, either on tax policy or possibly on, in this case, Senator Dierks' bill, the low-level nuclear waste on community consent. Certainly those were bills that had immediate impact on people and so they were very emotional things on both sides and very emotional issues and people were willing to go to the wall for those issues because something was going to happen. This is one of those enigmas. This is one of those issues that we're going through this procedure for absolutely no reason whatsoever, absolutely no reason whatsoever. We know the bill is not going to pass. There aren't even enough votes even to cease debate let alone have cloture, so we're sitting here for nothing. This amendment that they attempt to strike was an amendment offered right in the beginning, right up front that said, listen, let's avoid this, let's go to some of these other areas, let's avoid this type of what I would call a charade because we're not doing anyone any good and let's find something that we can hold our heads high on and say both sides are agreeing that it's a difficult issue, that we're not going to be able to accomplish the goal, that we are going to try to work together, we are going to look and see what the Supreme Court does and if the Supreme Court makes a ruling that overchange...overturns previous case law then we'll take a look at it. And, by the way, next year's session is going to have a lot of new people. So we don't really know what the votes are