

SENATOR WITHEM: I'm not 100 percent sure, Senator Chambers. I...I honestly have not made up my mind on that. I'm debating that as we speak.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. I'm just looking, members of the Legislature, Senator Morrissey's bill, which has a number of findings, and this is one of them, and I want you to listen carefully to this because I think it is not true. The government is...this is on page 3, it's lines 12 through 17 of the committee amendments to LB 1257. The government is better able to administer programs which offer a variety of benefits to industry and which reduce the overall cost of government involvement than to administer programs which offer few benefits to industry and require increasingly extensive, complex, and costly governmental actions. That's not true. If you're going to spend...if you're going to have more money to run a program, which offers fewer benefits, that is easier to administer than a program with not as much money that's required to offer many benefits. So, here is a statement in a bill which is not true, but it was not even challenged, yesterday, when this very significant bill was being discussed. So, any bill, probably, that is before us this session, with findings or declarations of intent, any bill would probably contain provisions that are either totally inaccurate, that are of questionable accuracy, and certainly that allow for more than one opinion. I happen to know that there are interests that don't want this bill passed. Senator Withem is not one of them, nor a part of that clack. But however a bill comes to be positioned where it can be derailed, the ones who would like to see it defeated would jump on that and be happy for that occurrence to take place. If Senator Withem does call for a vote on his motion, I will vote against it. I am for the bill. I don't want anything to happen that will give the enemies of the bill an opportunity to kill it, that's my main reason. My second reason is that far worse language, if this is bad language, then the next step, in comparison, is worse, far worse language than this, far more inflammatory language than this, language that attacks institutions of government already is found in the statute by way of so-called intent language. So, for those reasons, I definitely will vote against Senator Will...I mean Senator Withem's motion to bring the bill back and Senator Will's probable desire...Let me ask him a question first. Senator Will, may I ask you a question?