

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Landis, followed by Senators Beutler and Chambers.

SENATOR LANDIS: My mother used to have an expression that she'd savor now and then, are you worrying that tooth? And by that she meant if you had your tongue and you were running it over your tooth that was a little loose, and you were just playing with it, you know, because you couldn't leave it alone, it was irritating you. And I think Senator Chambers and Senator Beutler are worrying this bill to death, except that it's not going to be to its death, it's not going to get killed. And I think the whole worrying of this particular bill is for naught. First, it's going to pass. So if you're an opponent to this bill, if you're going to worry this thing to death, it's not going to get there. The bill is going to pass. Secondly, if you are a proponent the worrying doesn't do you anything anyway and that's because this bill doesn't do anything worth doing. It doesn't do anything which is not now required because our Attorney General reviews every rule and reg for its legality, including its constitutional obligations to meet the takings standards which are now part of our constitutional provisions. So this whole worrying of the bill really is unnecessary. And I think the deeper phenomenon that's going on is that this is an opportunity to further the current political agenda that says government is wrong, government makes many mistakes, government oversteps its bounds. For every step forward it takes, it takes three steps back. It makes life not better but worse for people because it gets in their way. And we found a way of looking at this proposal to further that general argument that we hear on CNN, or talk shows, on radio and the like. I find it a very troubling political agenda, one that I don't agree with. I'm simply just going to vote against LB 168. I don't think there's any amount of tinkering that can make this bill do something of value because there's nothing in it worth saving. There's nothing in it that accomplishes an agenda or a substantive change of rights or remedies for people. What it is, is a political flag that we're waving and we're going to wind up on one of two sides of this political flag waving. I find it tiresome. I would suggest to both those who are trying to make... what, a sow's ear into a silk purse that it's not going to happen, don't bother. You can't get there from here. You can't turn this into a silk purse because there isn't any element of silk in this whatsoever. I would suggest that we sit down, give Jim Jones his chance to make his argument and then