

SENATOR LYNCH: Question.

SPEAKER BARRETT: We've had no discussion yet on the motion. Thank you. Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker and members, I rise to oppose Senator Wehrbein's amendment as I do Senator Haberman's amendment. As we sit here and talk and it's one of those things, you know, we probably spend our time on more important things, but maybe not. Try and think about, you know, why you're elected and why we serve here is to represent the people of Nebraska. My concern is if you adopt either one of these amendments what you simply do is hand the agenda to the Governor's office, that's all you've done, you just simply...the Governor can write the agenda for special session, calls for the session on the things that he or she wants us to, and we have no control over them. You know, look at the worksheet, at the bills that we've dealt with this year, the ones that have already been approved by the Governor, the ones on Final Reading. You know how many of those could have waited until next year? A lot of them maybe could have. On the other hand, how many of them couldn't have, and how many people have access to you but don't have access to the Governor. Like Senator Robak's bioptic lense bill, you know, is the Governor going to call a special session to help that person out? No. With our present form of sessions every year we could deal with those problems. And a senator that has...it's not the most earth-shaking bill in the world, but it's very important to one particular person, and obviously that senator feels it's right or they wouldn't introduce it. Under our present system we can react in November or December of an odd numbered year, introduce a bill in the even numbered session, if it's relatively noncontroversial we can get it passed and we can help our constituents. If you adopt either one of these amendments you take away that. And, sure, that person maybe could wait two more years before they get their problem solved, maybe they're broke by then, maybe they can't get a drivers license, but what are we here for? We're here to try and help those people out. I think if your concern is meeting too many days, passing too many laws, I think you're a lot better off going...defeating both these amendments, maybe adopting LR 233 as is and you're changing the total number of days down to 120. But at least you can come in every year and react to those constituent concerns. Granted, some of them can wait two years, but some of them