

discussion on the bill and amendments. And then the system began to be used by the rules. I was one of those, among others. And it got to the point where the people who were for LB 769 said, this is enough, we've had enough, it's time to cease debate, this is not a good debate at this time. And the motion came up. The system was working fine. And when the votes were taken to cease debate the votes weren't there and debate continued. Procedurally, things followed and there was another vote to be taken on LB 769, the second vote. Let's cease debate. It was late in the...it was in the session...I don't remember if it was late or not now that I think about it, it was in the session last year. Everybody in the body knew the vote was going to be taken. Everybody knew approximately what time the vote was going to be taken and when the vote arrived the votes weren't there. The system worked and the votes simply weren't there to cease the debate. Even though I have read article after article about if we were allowed to vote on the issue, we would have gotten this done, the fact is you had two chances to vote on it and you didn't get it done. So the fact of the failure of one side to get the votes that they needed twice, they used that as the excuse to come up on a bill this year on 854 and say, because of our failure but we're not going to call it that, we're going to call it because of those bad guys keeping us from getting what we wanted to, we're justified in ceasing debate clear through the system. And whenever you do that, I don't care if it's on an ethanol hill...bill, I don't care if it's on above-ground storage tanks, I don't care if it's on LB 1059, or whatever the issue would be, whenever anybody comes out and says because of something last year we're going to have motions to move it across without any debate, any amendments, and it's an emotional issue, you can bet your bottom dollar that somebody will have the courage to say, time out here, time out. And then you ask yourself the next question, when time out was called, when both sides snarled and flared, when the sparks went, were the motions withdrawn so we could have had reasonable debate? And I grant you, probably at some point it would have drug on and on and a motion to reconsider would have been in order and then you would have had your third chance to do that. Did that process ever happen? And the answer is no. No. And, my friends, there will always be people out there in this country who will rebel any time on an emotional issue, one side or another, tries to move something across without debate, without amendments. If the situation were reversed and I was leading the charge, doing what 854 proponents have tried to do, I guarantee you we would be in the