

SENATOR CHAMBERS: All right. I want to be sure I don't miss anything that I thought was very, very important. I will have to jump to Chrysler which has produced a car, it's either the X or K Model, it's a total failure. Iacocca was fired by Ford and he went over to Chrysler. They are almost bankrupt. So how is the government going to bail them out? They gave them a contract to make the M-1 Tank, \$3 million a shot. And the next ten years Chrysler will get \$19 billion for making this tank which under simulated battlefield conditions fails 81 percent of the time. Hydraulic fluid leaks into the tank and it can become a fireplace for the ones riding it. The treads don't work. The machine gun is almost impossible to be aimed. So this is an idea of what happens with governmental inspections. The reason I said that is because we have a lot of situations where the only ones genuinely given concern are those who make money from the system. The concern of welfare for the citizens goes by the boards. So I don't have enough time to say everything that I had intended to say, but I want to emphasize my opposition to this amendment, not just because of what it says in words, but because it is a perversion of the legislative process. It attempts to write an interim study into law, and I think it is giving the Governor the opportunity to manipulate the Legislature. And to quote some of my conservative friends, Senator Kahle, "I am getting a little sick and tired of this".

SENATOR NICHOL PRESIDING

SENATOR NICHOL: Senator Higgins.

SENATOR HIGGINS: Mr. President, members of the body, I have voted consistently for LB 35, and I told Senator Vickers this morning that if the DeCamp amendment fails and the bill goes forward to the Governor and if the Governor vetoes it, I will vote to override the Governor's veto. But I am supporting the DeCamp amendment. So why would somebody who has consistently voted for LB35 and says they will vote to override a Governor's veto be for the DeCamp amendment? My original reason for being...for doing away with state inspections has not changed. As Senator Chambers just mentioned, I have been for it all along because of the rip-offs and unethical operators who have been doing state inspections. And I think at one time when I spoke in favor of this bill, I mentioned the fact that one particular operator tried to force us into buying new shock absorbers on a car that was one year old, and subsequently tested by three different operators. They were proven to be fine. Now at that time I wrote a letter to the Motor Vehicles Bureau and they didn't give me the courtesy of an