

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...from the state. What I would like to see is a legislative assembly composed primarily of women. Right now that's just a potential, but it can happen. Being a majority of the population, women have enough votes to put their true representatives in legislatures throughout this country, but they have been conditioned and brow-beaten so long, that they're not aware of the political strength that they have. I don't think it should be a political issue, I don't think legislatures should be involved, but since certain forces want to require the matter to be handled in that fashion, these women are going to have to start populating legislatures with people who are genuinely concerned about their rights and will do all they can to use that legislative machinery to see that their rights are indeed protected.

SENATOR HEFNER: Time. Senator Landis, followed by Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, and thank you for Senator Lindsay's crystallization. I'm sure that he had some things on his mind he wanted to make clear in the record and it is hard to sit for a long time and have your motives impugned as he must have felt that he had and then finally have a chance to express them. Let me say that knowing the context of the question that is asked, if Senator Lindsay is asking me if I intend to continue to do what I'm doing, the answer is yes. What I have done so far is to offer a sum total of four substantive amendments, one to an amendment on...to an amendment on LB 769 which removed an unconstitutional principle which, had it been attached to the bill, would have made it unconstitutional. I have offered three substantive amendments to LB 688. I have made no amendments to LB 769, nor have I made any procedural motions. I have, on the other hand, taken advantage of every opportunity that I could to speak under the rules that were accorded me and I will tend to continue to speak when I see in this case a perception of policy which has very, very disastrous outcomes. I had told you that the court case of Hodgson v. Minnesota had reached a number of findings of fact and I had been reciting to you some of those findings of fact which this concept was found to have by a review of lengthy testimony by experienced professionals, judges, social workers, ministers and the like in the adjudication of a Minnesota statute. The findings of fact go on. They say, in addition, the statute delays the procedure of