

to a situation where we were last week which is that we have a...we already have a statute on this very subject in the law, and so I ask the same question to all of you, why are we doing this? Why are we spending seven days to put into effect a statute that already exists in Nebraska law? The only reason that I can see to do it is because certain groups in this state want a vote up or down on a piece of legislation. I can see no other rationale when you have in statute a law that covers this very topic, passed in 1979, which is constitutional under the Eight Circuit decision. So someone explain to me why we are doing this over and over again when it exists in statute? And then if someone would explain to me that in a rational way, we can talk about what harassment is. We can talk about what the real motivation is behind this legislation. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, welcome to the post Roe v. Wade days because there is a whole lot more of this coming down the pike. I'll tell you right now the balance of power on this issue is not in the hands of those of us who are getting on the floor and speaking a lot. There is two camps that are as committed as committed can be. The power on this issue right now lies with people like Jerry Conway, Doug Kristensen, Dennis Byars, Lowell Johnson, John Weihing, Paul Hartnett, people who have not been on their feet and people who need to instruct us what we're going to do here, and I'll tell you why. It seems to me that we ought...right now we're getting ready to simply do away with the rest of the session and you've got to understand these two camps believe absolutely in what they're doing. This would be the same thing that would happen if we had a bill in here by somebody who said I have read the Bible and we can't let the races marry, and let's say they had a majority. Ernie Chambers would go crazy. He would tie the session up. No rule would bind him from allowing that kind of action. The rules would not stand in the way of such a moral pronouncement and it's getting just about that point right now. The rules will not confine this fight. The reconsideration motion, it's a little hazy in the rule book here and the rule book won't help us. My suggestion is this. First, that we defeat the Bernard-Stevens motion not because it isn't timely, David, but because it keeps us away from getting to the underlying issue. We ought to get back to the reconsideration on the suspension of the rules and to see where the votes are. If there are 30 votes, then we ought to do that.