

next time is not a good argument, it's not a valid argument and I would be more than remiss if I didn't say to the body that there is going to be at some point X amount into A bills this session. It may be as little as three, may be as much as \$5 million, I don't know. But I know this bill takes a major portion of that out at a time when there are some questions that need to be answered and at that point...I don't like saying this because usually I'm the one that's in a rush, but I think this is one of those cases that we need to slow down a little bit...

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: ...and say, wait a minute, what are we doing? How fast are we going? Do we have to do it now? Is the money there to do it now? And we need to take some serious looks at that aspect of it. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. Is there anyone else wishing to discuss the advancement of LB 732? Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I have just one comment. I would like to ask Senator Kristensen a question. Senator Kristensen, if you look at page 2 of the bill, since we've gotten into...or page 3, some of these other issues than the nature of the bill itself and its merits, it talks about an operative date in line 4. To provide an operative date, yet there is no operative date provided in the bill so what would you say to an operative date of June 1, 1994? July 1, 1994?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: I would strenuously object.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: January 1, 1994?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: I would object.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Not as strenuously?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: More strenuously.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: When we delay it less time, you would object more strenuously than if we delay it a longer time. Would you prefer July, '94 to January, '94?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: I was just trying to apply that example you