

SENATOR SCHMIT: Well, Mr. President and members, Senator Labeledz and others have spoken many times this past week on LB 769. Senator Labeledz has chosen to offer this motion this morning, and I have agreed that I would speak to the motion, and not only to the motion but to the procedure. The procedure has been done before, will be done again I'm sure some time or other. There are many, many methods whereby this body can function. There are also other methods whereby it can be brought to a halt. I couldn't help but notice in my friends in the press, particularly those who are more liberally bent, speaking rather complimentarily about the efforts of Senator Chambers and Senator Bernard-Stevens to thwart the will of the majority of the Legislature relative to getting a vote on LB 769. That's the way the system works. And, as was pointed out by the press, those particular members are more gifted at using the procedure and the rules than are some of the rest of us. I also pointed out during the course of the week that the least experienced person on this floor can find the method whereby he or she can also tie up this body, if we wish to do so. And if some of us, who do not have any really high priorities, choose to tie up this body and bring it to a halt it doesn't take very much inclination or very much intelligence to do so. Senator Labeledz does have the votes, perhaps, to pass this motion. She has on many occasions tallied 30, 32, 33 votes in support of LB 769. The only thing she couldn't do was mechanically, procedurally get to that point where the bill could be allowed to advance with those votes. Senator Chambers announced ahead of time, he told us exactly what he could do and would do, and he is more skillful than most of us in carrying out his promise. Senator Chambers has never once deviated from his convictions relative to the bill. And I do not challenge his convictions, nor his right to those convictions, nor does he challenge myself nor Senator Labeledz as to the right we have for our convictions. The point that I think needs to be made is that this body, at some time or another, needs to decide are four days debate on a bill sufficient to relegate it to the ash can or to the boondocks, whatever you want to call it. Is that going to be the rule of thumb whereby if Senator Schmit, or Senator Labeledz, or Senator Chambers, or any other member of this body decides we want to talk a bill to death, do we only have to line up conversation for four days and then know that the opponent's bill is going to die. I'm the only person, I think, who has consistently voted against LB 397. I really had no...it is not a high priority kill type idea with me, I just think it's wrong. But if I wanted to stand here before you and argue the merits or demerits