March 30, 1990

SENATOR HEFNER: Senator Bernard-Stevens, followed by Senator Nelson. Okay, here he comes. Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body. I was delayed speaking as Senator Labedz was telling me how many amendments that she has filed on LB 1059, but I am going to disregard that for the time being and go to some other point. Senator Lindsay has legitimate, I think, frustrations and certainly has a legitimate claim to come up and do the lawyer bit of cross-examination with the yes and no And, of course, if he doesn't get what he wants answer. particularly, then it is hypocrisy, and that probably works well in a court of law, and quite honestly, it may even make him feel better. But the point is that people cannot be put into categories quite as easily as some of us would like to do. People are dying to put me in a radical pro-choice category, and, I am sorry, you will never be able to do that. It is just not true. You are not going to be able to put me in a radical pro-life category. That is definitely not true. And the question Senator Lindsay asked was kind of interesting because I was third on the list, hoping that he'd get to Senator Schimek, but he never did. And I had time to think about that a little bit, just for a little brief moment about whether I would continue doing what obviously is a delaying, filibuster type of procedure, and it kind of brought back to me how I got into this mess in the first place. And I think one of the things that we have to always be careful of as people, whether we are senators, whether we are lawyers, whether we are custodians, maybe even just unemployed, we always have to keep in mind that that which appears may not be what it seems, and I know that can be twisted a lot of ways. I have consistently said, whether members of the body want to believe it or not, that Senator Chambers and I have a different agenda on LB 769. When I got involved on the LB 769, and it is the same reason I am involved now, was when we got to the point where the majority was saying we could ... we do not care about even considering, we do not care about even discussing, we do not care about even working together on certain aspects we might be able to do, all we want is the Minnesota bill. And when we had that type of mentality, I balked and I said, I am sorry, that is not how representative government works. And I know that is not a yes and no answer, but when anybody takes away the absolute right, and they don't even care to change because they want something in a particular way, even though it may not be the best law, they just want that particular one, not only will I balk, I will call it what it is,