

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

March 9, 2004

LB 906

we're discussing here relative to body art. That person should not be prevented from pursuing his or her livelihood simply because he or she is inarticulate, even incoherent. Because a person who wants to take advantage of this service does not care how the person expresses himself or herself orally or in writing, except insofar as the writing, if you want to call it that, which may be done on the canvas of the client's body. So my amendment would strike the words "completion of education." When Senator Stuhr's amendment is presented, it will retain some of what it is we're trying to express in the existing language, including, I believe, the waiver that the department can grant. But there is some language that I think needs to be tightened up, even under her amendment. In line 19, we have the words "upon submission of evidence satisfactory to the department." I think we should state what this evidence relates to so there can be no doubt of what we're talking about. Members of the Legislature, when there is an issue that I'm discussing and I'm not opposed to it but time must be taken, it's not quite as easy or as enjoyable for me as when I'm battling and lambasting. Since Senator Combs this morning acknowledged that she's picked up a clue or two from you know who...the correct word would be "whom" but it doesn't rhyme...oh maybe it would...from you know whom in this room. But anyway, sometimes we will diverge from what we're talking about and touch on other things that may be of consequence to us either on the present bill or something that is going to come up later. Later on today, there will be some matters that I will discuss based on what the bill is, but I will talk about other matters also. Right now, I want to mention that Senator Adrian Smith, who is not here right now, that I can see, will probably vote with me now against any attempts to lower the number of votes necessary to invoke cloture. That is an issue that I'm going to discuss, because we can never talk about it when the motion is made to invoke cloture, because there is no discussion. But one of our colleagues put out a document explaining why he wanted to reduce the number of votes required from 33 to 30. He has not thought through the issue because he does not get involved in legislative matters to the depth that some of us do which has caused us to review why certain rules are in place. First of all, I wouldn't object to lowering the vote from 33 to 25 if, as in the U.S. Senate, there is no limit imposed on me in terms of