

May 22, 1981

LB 472A

privately here, we've had some conversations, Davy knows it, what I have offered and what I have done, simply the mechanical, if you want to call it the strategy, the motions to get to the issue so that a majority of this body who wanted to take up the issue would have the mechanical means of doing it. That is what I have done. For that, some of my good friends say, well you low life and so on and so forth. That is the method using the majority. You quite honestly now are using the methods of the minority. I don't condemn you a bit if you are using a filibuster or whatever but don't say Johnny is so bad simply because he offers a way through some of the mazes so thirty or thirty-five people who wanted to deal with this issue this year would have a chance. You now have, I don't know, eight, ten, fifty, four hundred motions. It was exactly anticipation of that why I had to pick a bill on Final Reading. Ernie understands it better than anybody. Had I picked a bill any other stage of the process, you would have control. Right? Right. This way it can only come back for a specific amendment, has to go forward. After that amendment or die there if it doesn't get enough votes and the burden is on you then to try to do anything further in terms of taking it back and Senator Landis was correct. From a strategical standpoint the majority in here would be foolish if they were successful now in advancing it if they didn't go ahead and move to adjourn because it then basically leaves your filibuster up to when the bill is read on Final Reading and I suspect the majority of the body, some of you will change your minds by then and decide one way or another that whether it is the last bill to be read on Final Reading or whatever, that it will resolve the issue then. But don't fault me so much for simply offering a procedural method when you are doing exactly the same thing, exactly. I have never used a filibuster, never once. I have always mustered thirty votes or tried to do it that way. I don't fault you. Don't condemn me for simply offering Senator Stoney, Senator Kremer, Senator Peterson and half a dozen others in here who feel very intense about this issue, the opportunity to bring it before the forty-nine people that have the only power in the state at this time to do one single thing about this issue and if the vote now is twenty-five to advance it, it means at least twenty-five people, a majority of the body, have decided that they would like to take a temporary solution here until January until we can meet again and discuss it further, rather than closing down the schools immediately, rather than locking people up. That, I guess, since we want to get demerits now, that don't seem to me to be so bad, to look at it as a legislative body, June, July, August whenever, rather than just say, well the Supreme Court spoke and what did they speak on? Was it a law? Not really. It was an interpretation of law essentially by, I suppose Anne Campbell or who ever is head of the Department of Education, a rule,

5709