

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

January 12, 2006 LB 57

SENATOR PAHLS: Yes, I would be comfortable with this. If this terminology needs to be changed and it's done correctly, I would...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, doesn't your research indicate it should be changed?

SENATOR PAHLS: Like I said, my light research has.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, if your light research is not enough to persuade you, and you're not sure that it's accurate, why did you give it to us? I assume that you thought what you were reading was correct.

SENATOR PAHLS: Right, I do.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. If it's correct and it shows that this word is too restrictive, why will you not agree to a word that your research showed you was more encompassing?

SENATOR PAHLS: That's what I said. When we vote on it, you will see where I stand.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. We shall see what we shall see. I appreciate this, Senator Pahls.

SENATOR PAHLS: Thank you.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Members of the Legislature, I have eight hours and I'm going to take my eight hours. And, frankly, I'm enjoying myself. Some of you might be too, because at least you don't have to sit here, listen to the same old thing over and over, and you don't have to listen to some of my colleagues who are about as exciting as a piece of soggy toast,...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...about as appetizing as a piece of cold half-cooked bacon in half-congealed grease. You don't want that on your plate, so why should we serve it up to you as an intellectual snack? Because that's all we do in this