

to bring in a bill next year to deal with this particular topic or Senator Haberman or any member of this body. But it's a different issue. It's an issue that has, really, it's become quite controversial and I think it should be in its own form in a piece of legislation introduced possibly next year. It did have its day in the sun. It was rejected by the committee. We could have added it to the bill at that particular time. The committee chose not to because it dealt with a different subject matter and we did not support the concept. For those reasons, I would support the Chair's decision to restrict this particular amendment from being added to LB 732.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Abboud. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam Chair, I'm happy to have you back. I'm unhappy about your ruling which I, unfortunately, but most respectfully must disagree with. I think the arguments that were given in favor of overruling the Chair have been right on point. And what I wish the members would keep in mind is the distinction between whether or not this amendment is germane to the bill and the attitude that you may have toward the amendment itself. We're not arguing whether you support adoption of the amendment but only whether or not such an amendment as this can appropriately be offered to this bill. Not one of the statements that Senator Abboud gave would justify sustaining the Chair. Senator Abboud's arguments were against the amendment on its merits. He talked about the committee's reaction to it, how, in his opinion, it would be better to bring it as an individual bill. He discussed the controversial nature of the amendment. None of those things have anything to do whatsoever with whether or not there is enough relationship between the amendment and the bill to justify its being considered germane and being allowed to be offered. When you have a bill such as this which the courts want and there are so many attempts to stifle every attempt to alter it in any way, unless it's with prior approval of the judges, it indicates that we are not an independent co-equal branch of this state government. We are subordinating ourselves to the judiciary and that is not what we ought to do. We can pass bills on property taxes and whine and argue and plead and beg through the media and other means with the court to uphold those laws and the court disagrees and strikes them down unceremoniously along with a lecture. Then we, who are in the process of legislating, who have been given the total power and authority under the state Constitution to legislate, will give up that right, that responsibility, that