

pretty soon and I know there are some of you in here that believe strongly in Christian schools and we want some minimal constraints. Why not protect young people? And if I were a person seeking child care and I am being paid for it, then I should apply to minimal standards and I don't think they are unreal. The only thing is they are not enforced in a lot of counties and I would advise the Senator from Imperial, he brought a bill before the Public Works a year or two ago about end guns on irrigating systems because he had a report from a principal that it was making the road muddy and it was dangerous for the buses. I would sooner have my children in that bus going through a puddle of mud than in a home where there may be a severe disaster and nobody could get them out. I would remind the Senator from Grand Island that the previous Senator had this same bill here a few years ago. His name was Senator Kelly and I don't think we ought to relax it. We ought to stick with it and we ought to advise the counties through this kind of a message in public debate that they ought to do their homework and those of us who come from Douglas County, I have seen a lady quit this summer because the county attorney wouldn't enforce the law when she advised him of day care centers and other care centers that were not in compliance. That is the fault of the county enforcement officials, not our fault. So we also have a bill that says you can't buy cigarettes until you are sixteen. I see a lot of kids playing with vending machines buying them but at least the law is there. It has been there I don't know how long so in that case we ought to repeal all laws that are not being complied with because obviously they are not being enforced. I support the indefinite postponement of LB 270.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Newell.

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President, members of the body, I sense that this is the most symbolic of symbolic issues that will come before this Legislature and we should keep this very simple. We should not look at the bill. We should not understand its ramifications. We should keep it simple. And I think that the proponents of the indefinite postponement motion have made it and tried to keep it very simple. On one hand it is those people that wholesale want to unlicense these care, these providers of care for young children. If you love children, you have got to vote for the indefinite postponement motion. On the other hand, it is these rural guys that see it totally as deregulation and they don't understand and so, therefore, they are wrong. I want to say that I don't know that the bill is that simple or that the issue is that simple. In