

February 22, 1991 LB 88

question of Senator Pirsch, what's the hurry, it's actually not...I'm not sure that the question is, what's the hurry. This is, it seems to me, the argument of those who oppose the bill, to drag it out, to allow it other and collateral issues to catch up to use and some open questions to be raised, asked, and do the tying up and making an amendment to clarify, that kind of offer and language. But what's at the heart of this are two intractable opponents. This is not cleaning up language, that's not what's being offered here. We don't have two groups that are basically in agreement but they just haven't found the perfect language and they're trying to put the bow on the package. What you have is two contending groups that are fighting for timing, they're fighting for other issues, they're using leverage, they're trying to wait for when there are 25 votes, when there aren't 25 votes, and with that respect a bracket motion, while there might be some value for time for some kind of amendment, would make sense if, in fact, both parties were committed to the passage of the bill and they wanted just to get the language right, the kind of thing that you might do. That's not true here. What you have is two contending factions that are waiting, not only to the tenth hour to have a knock-down-drag-out, but the eleventh hour to have a knock-down-drag-out, and then half-way through the eleventh hour, and now it's eleven fifty-nine and they still want to have a knock-down-drag-out, and we search for excuses to have it. This is not that kind of moment where all parties are committed to a bill passing and you want to put it in the perfect language. This is strategic and tactical advantage on other issues and on fighting this one. The language is clear, but to the extent that it's not clear, if there should be anything that's not clear, it seems to me that the proponents of the measure are saying we'll take the burden, we'll take the risk, and now is our moment. Let's proceed with the issue. If we need to, let's defeat the bracket motion. But for the purpose for the bracket motion to be raised I think has been answered in the debate, and the bracket motion itself no longer continues to have rationale, if it is for the creating of a legislative record and a clear record of intent, we have it. We don't need language to do that at this point. It is the safer path to have that language. But we're not all committed to this idea happening. What we have is the opponents that are asking the proponents to make their language clear when the proponents say our language clear when the proponents say our language is clear enough for our sakes, we'd like to go ahead. Let's simply address the issue today and see where the votes are. If these