

February 23, 1996 LB 415, 948

in your bill books, it is behind LB 948, and I encourage you to read it, to talk with your bankers, to talk with your credit union people, and, indeed, inspect it with a fine-tooth-comb.

SENATOR CROSBY: Time.

SENATOR PIRSCH: I don't...

SENATOR CROSBY: Senator Pirsch, your light is next.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you. I under...yes, uh-huh. I understand Senator Beutler's concern with the process. Quite frankly, I have done this many times and so has...well, Senator Beutler has been here during those years too when we have done it. It is something that, that I think needs to be done, has been a year in the making, and if Senator Landis were here I'm sure he could be even more articulate on this matter. Senator Bernard-Stevens, did you have some other things to say? You may have my time.

SENATOR CROSBY: You have four minutes.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Senator Pirsch and members of the Legislature. I don't know what Senator Landis has done on the consent calendar. I know on looking at the consent calendars we have, the bill, LB 415, has not appeared yet. I know there are lots of requests, I don't know if the Speaker is going to put it on consent calendar or not. So, Senator Pirsch is very accurate, I think, when she says that it may or may not be on consent calendar, it's her hope that it would be. Senator Pirsch, I can't...Senator Pirsch, Carol, I can't on Final Reading put a kill motion on, I mean, because you either vote it up or down. But we could do that would do the same thing is just pass it over and then when we get to Select...to Final Reading again, next time it would be the first one on the list. It would accomplish the same thing. So if that would be your discretion just to pass over the bill, that would give us the chance to look at the amendment, and then if people felt comfortable when you came up on Final Reading you could then offer the amendment again and we could have a debate and/or maybe, truly noncontroversial and it'd be no problem. So that's what my suggestion would be. Otherwise I suspect we're going to have some protracted debate on an amendment that many of the members haven't seen and they're going to be a little bit leery