

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...I either north or south of Dodge Street, and I think that this would work toward that end so that those individuals can have their voices heard again because there is changes taking place in both sides of that area in the county that we have not had a voice to listen to our concerns, so I strongly support the effort to move to districtwide elections and I would hope that the body would support the reconsideration motion. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Bernard-Stevens, followed by Senator Labeledz.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I'll be very brief. Sometimes after an emotional vote that you have, that we had on LB 356, it's difficult to make a mental transition and I sense the body is in that transition, particularly with so many people not here right now, I'm sure in the offices listening to the squawk box. So I'm going to try to recap what happened last week to kind of freshen one's memory. First of all, I will be supporting the reconsideration motion and I will be voting against the Labeledz amendment. One of the things that happened last week when this bill came up before the power outage was that there was a lot of confusion on the body as to what exactly the Labeledz amendment did. And during the vote there was considerable discussion in the Chamber about what was happening and immediately after the vote I know of at least two members that said, gee, I didn't realize that part of it, and Senator Smith was one that came up quickly and asked for the...filed a reconsideration motion. Had the power outage not gone out, there were the votes for the defeat of the Labeledz amendment and the votes for Senator Chambers' bill as it was. I have to smile, Senator Labeledz, I've always said that Omaha senators have tremendous power. You were a little bit short on votes and you even got the power to go off on the Legislature and I was truly impressed, I'm impressed by that. But nonetheless, the body was very much confused. One of the things I'd like to at least clarify for the body, at least in my view, is that the Labeledz amendment though very, very well-intended, and I know that they're trying to compromise in what they feel is a compromise. I always get a chuckle out of compromises, the fact of who are compromises between. I've always thought compromises were between the introducer of the bill and those that were against and in the body I find out the compromises is