

consent calendar bill. You know, the ironic thing about this is we deal with these issues, as Senator Pirsch said, different treatment of different things. There's a consent calendar bill out there right now that deals with an issue in the sales tax arena; has to do with the issue of sales tax on installation services. It's on consent calendar right now. We passed that bill a year ago but it had an inadvertent effect, so everybody said, well, that's not what we intended, that's not what we meant. That bill is scooting right along. It's LB 1187, I believe. It's on consent calendar. You can pull up the yellow sheet on the backside of the agenda right now. It's there. We're going to move that right along and say, we made a mistake, we're going to correct it. But, in this case, for some reason, the ironic thing is when you're dealing with a bill that was ultimately truth in sentencing, we're not going to be truthful about what the impact was. We're going to ignore that and say, hey, we basically slid this one by you. We want it. We want to keep it. Now that it's there, you damn right, we don't want to change it. Now we want to talk policy. The institution deserves better than that, ladies and gentlemen. The process deserves better than that. This is an good an example as I can find to do away with consent calendar altogether, which I believe is a process that, you know, maybe expedites some things but it leaves itself open to exactly this kind of a mishap, this kind of a problem. We should not be dealing with this type of material in a consent calendar bill. I believe it was inadvertent on Senator Pirsch's part, I absolutely do, but that... be that as it may, the impact that it has had, the effect that it potentially will have is one that we will pay for for a number of years. It's one that deserves debate. It is a serious policy change that is not consent calendar material. Actually, it's a kind of thing that was brought in into LB 627, a major rewrite...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...of the criminal laws in this state, and it was rejected by the Judiciary Committee. It never surfaced on the floor because it was a hot topic. It came back in an amendment that basically slid a repealer in that had a total different effect, dramatic impact, other than a mirror image or almost mirror image amendment to LB 627. There's no doubt about that. There is no question about that. Put the two amendments up to each other, look at what the impact is when you apply one to LB 627 and one to LB 529. It is not in question. That is what