

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 12, 1999 LB 126

have this idea and we are taking pieces of it out. And we don't know whether it will all wind up in or not. Anyway, I don't mind the build-down approach that we're doing now, but I'm going to tell you that the whole committee amendment, as a whole, I think is overreaching and I'm...I'm going to vote against the committee amendment. What I don't want to have happen is I don't want to have those of us who are...have difficulties with the compliance checks be satisfied, and those of us who say, wait a second, we've moved away from the second offense to the third offense, and we've capped it, and we've moved too far on that portion of it, to be left on our own. It seems to me that those of us who think that the committee amendments have gone too far ought to...the best thing from my perspective is to defeat the committee amendments and start with what was a sound and tough bill, and then put back in things that the body is persuaded by 25 votes should be put back into the bill. That's my preference anyway. I just want to let you know that no matter what is the outcome of the Chambers-Schellpeper dialogue here, from my perspective, the committee amendment is the problem and the adoption of the committee amendment is the place where I intend to focus and vote no, even as I choose, maybe, to vote for some of the Chambers' amendments and maybe not for others of them. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Landis. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President, members of the Legislature, nothing would make, if I have a heart, nothing would make my heart gladder this morning than for us to proceed in the way that Senator Landis suggested, but in going after portions of this committee amendment, I tried to strike the entire part that dealt with the State Patrol and couldn't get enough votes. So if they are unwilling to strike that part, they probably would be unwilling to let go of the entire committee amendment. And then some of this very unacceptable material, as I perceive it, would then be a part of the bill. And I know that the battle could be waged on the bill, itself. But we're not able to focus on exactly what the bill ought to do as long as these side issues are on the field. I'm going to put something that I've got to put into the record, and it's going to offend by "Repelican" friends. But there is an individual in Washington who serves as the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and