March 30, 1990 LB 688

amendment, if it's done in concert with Senator Labedz withdrawing her's, allowing Senator Lindsay to put his amendment above it, and then to refile my amendment right immediately thereafter. That would be satisfactory to me.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, this is going to be The only rule that I could find relative to interesting. co-sponsors relates to a bill. And I think by analogy it should apply to an amendment. A bill cannot be withdrawn or even attempted to be withdrawn, except by the chief introducer with the concurrence of the co-sponsors. Now, if they want to suspend that rule, then again I can object to it and say that it's not a good step to take. But I would rather see that happen instead of Senator Landis trying to have a vote of 25 people to allow him to withdraw an amendment on which my name appears. I didn't want to discuss an amendment that he had pending, because I thought it was inappropriate for me to try to represent his position, since I knew that in all ways mine was not completely congruent with his. But, again, as we approach this critical point in the session, things begin to change and people begin to see matters a different way. Now, if I live by the rules, I have to die by the rules. But I would rather see you suspend that rule, about the co-sponsor, before you let Senator Landis...well, you can do anything with 25 votes that you want to. That's what I know you can do. And who am I to object to that, other than to say that you have to go outside the rules, whereas I stay within them. But, if that is attempted, then I will have to find a way to fight that. And I'm sure that I can do that. And I assure you that I will do that. But the matter before us right now is a reconsideration of Senator Landis's amendment or motion to return this bill for a different amendment, one that he offered earlier in the day, much earlier I might add. The language in the amendment is really inconsequential, because the necessity that was seen by some of us was that there be discussion and debate. There have been both. We have had very lengthy and extensive debate. And at one point during the afternoon I think it was very informative, very productive. It's regrettable that what was produced is one of these nepharious stratagems or schemes which often occurs at the end of the session. Have I been outfoxed? Have I been outflanked? Have I been tricked? Will the Legislature agree to do and establish a precedent what I think ought to be done, if it's to be done at all, only by suspending