

forward. And we can do something about the problem of the environment and solid waste now with this bill. I think the public cares about the environment. I think they know that solid waste is a big problem. I think they want action, I think they want us to take that action by overriding the veto of LB 163. I do want to note that Senator Hefner talked about the retail businesses, they seem to be the main opposition to this legislation. They're talking about 25 or 50 dollar fees, and this is only for the largest retail operations with at least \$100,000 in sales. Maybe half of the businesses would be exempted from any fee whatsoever. It's not too much to ask them to be part of the solution to the problems of solid waste, to be part of the solution to the problem of the environment in this state. This is a small attempt, I think, to ask them to contribute to some of the funding of this problem. The tire companies are willing to pay, others are willing to pay, this problem is too important to ignore. I think that we should override this veto. This is a very important matter and I hope that you will vote likewise to override the veto.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. May I introduce some guests, please of Senator Coordsen under the north balcony. We have Senator Coordsen's son, Kevin, his friend, Monica Scott, and Des'iree. Would you folks please stand so we may recognize you. Thank you. Senator Korshoj, please.

SENATOR KORSHOJ: Question.

PRESIDENT: Question has been called. Do I see five hands? I do. And the question is, shall debate cease? All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record, Mr. Clerk, please.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 2 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Debate has ceased. Senator Rod Johnson, to close.

SENATOR R. JOHNSON: Yes, thank you, Mr. President. First of all, let me say Senator Hall did not write my speech. And I apologize to the audience who is watching on television who has made it clear that I used a poor choice of words, and I did, and I am sincerely sorry. If you want to censor me, that's fine. But I hope it won't take away from the debate on 163, because it is a substantial policy choice that this Legislature is going to have to make. There are good arguments, I think, on both sides. I guess I'm presenting a perspective that looks at this issue