

on the bill, knowing that the only vote that will be taken is when two hours have elapsed and you will have to go cloture? But would it not be interesting and wouldn't it be fun if the cloture motion failed? Then where are we? California, here I come, right back where I started from. That would really be interesting and would show that the Legislature is unpredictable, that the Legislature is an independent body, as sometimes I read that it is but which I know it's not. In fact, if I was going to characterize the Legislature, I would have to take a quote from Teddy Roosevelt, he, of the big teeth, who was upset with Oliver Wendell Homes to whom he appointed...I mean, he appointed him to the Supreme Court, I believe, but he didn't like the way Holmes was making decisions. He said, I could carve from a banana a justice with more backbone. That's what I could do with reference to the Legislature. I could carve from Jello a Legislature with more backbone than this one. The Governor goes out around the state and he says they had better pass that atrocity, and here it is before us. You all are going to be compelled to vote for it and you will vote for it because you don't really care what is in it. You have got to pass something called a crime bill because that's what we're told the public is clamoring for. If you all went to a restaurant and people recognized you, they're not going to run up to you and pull your coat sleeve and say, hey, I want a crime bill, I want a crime bill. That's not what they're talking to you about out there and you know it. In fact, if you go into the rural areas, they might be talking about the rains that have hindered the planting and then other people are worried about what they're paying in property taxes. Senator McKenzie is worried about LB 377, the ethanol bill, but I'm sure she doesn't have to worry anymore because all of those problems have been resolved, but I think that would probably be in her mind. When I read a list of statements from some of the leaders of the Legislature, Senator Maurstad didn't talk about crime. He talked about his work on the Appropriations Committee. Senator Wehrbein did the same thing, and some of the other leaders in that catalogue escape me, but not one of them talked about crime. The only time that issue comes up is if the questioner poses it and Mr. or Ms. interlocutor will say, what do you think about the crime bill? And the senators when they're honest they say mostly nothing, then they say but the public wants it and if you don't say something, I'm going to say you're not for the crime bill. So then all of the cliches pour out, we've got to fight crime. But which crimes do you think we ought to fight? You say, well, I think the ones that are against the law. And they say, well,