

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

February 1, 2000 LB 175

would be to kill the bill. Once this bill leaves the agenda, it's not coming back. I have offered, day after day, this same bracket motion. It has been overwhelmingly rejected day after day. So why do I offer it again? Because it's in my nature to continue a struggle once I'm in it and never yield unless I'm shown a reason to yield. I don't see that reason on this bill. In fact, based on some of the things that are coming back to me secondhand and thirdhand, my intent to fight it has been redoubled. So if it comes back on the agenda tomorrow, brothers and sisters, I will be here tomorrow morning and I'll be doing again what I'm doing now--bailing the Legislature out. But what often happens? Human nature is sometimes perverse. As a result, what often happens is that two sides reach a point where there can be no accommodation reached. That is being approached in Northern Ireland now with the Unionists on one side and Sinn Fein on the other. The Unionists say, all right, Louie, drop the gun. And Louie says, not on your life. So those who've sat back and watched are saying they have probably reached a point where everything that was put together, the fragile alliance, if you want to call it that, is going to fall apart and everything will be right back where it was. Well, on the floor of the Legislature, we let blood only figuratively, but we do let blood on occasion, and I have a lot of blood in my system and much of my blood has been let during the time I've been in this Legislature. In fact, if the blood of mine which has been shed on this floor tilting at windmills, trying to tweak the conscience of those far more righteous than I, I probably would be a "multigallon" contributor if my blood literally had been contributed to some blood bank. So I know what it means to bleed. But will the shedding of my blood cause me to quit? Of course not. When two forces that seem irreconcilable come together, we run up on the statement that shows how inferior education is and how little people analyze what they hear. They ask, what would happen if an irresistible force met an immovable object? The two concepts are mutually exclusive. If the force is irresistible, nothing can stand before it. So you can only have one or the other. If the object, on the other hand, is immovable, that means it's capable of resisting any and every force, so you cannot have both an irresistible force and an immovable object, but people say this all the time. Like with this bill, people are accustomed to having the landlords get their way, so what I'm doing is trying