

of the rules on each one of these bills before amendments had been offered. Senator Lindsay has offered such a motion to LB 375 and that's what we're talking about and we all know that too. If you haven't gathered from what I've said so far, I will make it clear in the last few seconds I have. I am opposed to the Speaker's motion.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Witek, your light is next.

SENATOR WITEK: Mr. Chairman, members of the body, I rise in opposition to the motion. I do have some concerns about one of the bills, LB 371. And, Senator Chambers, I don't think it's to keep you quiet because you've been pretty quiet this year. I think it's to keep me quiet because, see, I'm getting pretty noisy on LB 371 and my concerns with it and I've given everybody the news release that Governor Nelson put out after LB 507 was passed in 1993. And I was one of the individuals who didn't vote for LB 507, and my concern was that it was...it was a bad piece of legislation. It was a piece of legislation that was put into place, in my opinion, to stop crime legislation like the one that I was carrying at the time and that was referred to as the Stenberg crime bill, and that I had trouble passing because Senator Lindsay and others had said that the fiscal note on it was \$100 million, I think, was the estimate that he had given, and that we didn't have that. But Senator Lindsay comes back with nearly the same bill this year and there's zero fiscal note on it and we have killed the appropriations bill, and I went along with that kill motion because I wanted to avoid debate. That was trying to stifle, Senator Chambers, that one was. But I wanted to go ahead and get the crime bill passed, but at the time when Senator Wickersham brought up his concern on whether it complied with LB 507 I asked for an Attorney General's Opinion as to whether we would have problems with LB 371 because it obviously did not comply, in my opinion either, with 507, and he issues that opinion and I think most of you have had an opportunity to read it and look at that opinion and it says, yes, that if we do pass LB 371, since it does not comply with LB 507, which at the time you can...you can read through Governor Nelson's...at the time he said concern has been expressed that LB 507 unconstitutionally binds the actions of future Legislatures. Nelson says, well, he does not share that legal concern. At that time he did not share that legal concern, probably because it was my legal concern. The matter may well be decided in court. So I say that those individuals