

But I certainly will work on that. I will be supporting either version of the bracket motion. I will be voting for the Chambers amendment. Failing that, I will be voting for the Jones amendment, but I really wish you'd think just a little bit about the underlying bill and the argument of what it says about our process, that we can spend over 8 hours on a bill that has opposition and we really don't...can't point to anybody in the state that will benefit by its passage.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President, members of the Legislature, I am not so nice that I will take this as a closing. I am going to speak again on my motion, and on the bill. There are too many times when, as a Legislature, we will enact a piece of legislation and wash our hands of it and be through with it. We will never look at those who are going to be impacted by it. At some point, Senator Wehrbein and others on the Appropriations Committee, are going to determine that various agencies are going to have to find a way to reduce their requests to the Appropriation Committee by 2 percent, 8 percent, 10 percent, maybe 30 percent, and they will not have looked at the fact that they have created an expense on those agencies with a nonsensical piece of unnecessary legislation. You are creating an additional cost to every agency. They have to make this analysis with reference to every rule. Now if that is being compelled by the Legislature, why when the crunch comes, and we are talking about the budget, will some people recommend that we just make every agency across the board cut by 2 percent or whatever the amount happens to be when people grow very frustrated. Nobody will want to look back to this day when we were talking about LB 168 that does nothing of value. Let's say that we forget the fiscal impact and say that every agency somehow complies to the letter, and with the spirit of this amendment, and they produced this estimate. What results from it? If Senator Maurstad and Senator Hall had property that might be affected, maybe it would and maybe it wouldn't but they hate the rule, and they consult with an attorney, and I am the attorney. Once they retain me, the canons of professional ethics require me to represent my clients diligently and zealously, which means that if, under a theory of the law, they have a claim that can be made in court, I have to present it to them. So I tell Senator Hall and I tell Senator Maurstad, this agency has undertaken this evaluation and has determined that this rule, if put in place, is going to have this fiscal impact