

SENATOR COORDSEN: Senator Hudkins.

SENATOR HUDKINS: Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you, Senator Stuhr. Senator Bernard-Stevens said that we should sit back, we should look one more time at what we have done. And Senator Withem said that we used the rules appropriately, we have done the right thing at every step of the way. Now, is it Senator Stuhr's fault that we only have so few days left in the session? She declared her priority number ten. There were quite a few after her that wasted time in declaring what their priority was. How many hours did we debate LB 1044 before adjournment? How many hours have we spent on LB 901? And I'm sure you can all think of two or three other bills that we have spent a great deal of time on. How many bills have we already reached cloture on this year? In the first days of the session, how many bills did we advance per day? Whose fault was that? Is it efficient to have amendment after amendment after amendment just to waste time? The body made the decision yesterday on whether they wanted to discuss this bill. They said, yes, we want to discuss this bill. That's why they voted yes in the first place. Bills should be debated on their merits, not on friendship or on animosity. Neither should a senator decide what they're going to do on bills farther down the line, support or oppose, because of what one senator does to one of their bills ahead of that. Senator Brashear said that we need discussion on the parental notification on 943. We need discussion on the age limits. Senator Brashear, those items were discussed because I was in committee at the time. Now I don't plan to filibuster this bill. We're going to reach a vote whether we want to reconsider it or not. I'm not going to try to take up the full eight hours. I don't believe that Senator Stuhr is either. We introduced the bill because we thought it was a good bill. We thought the statute that is being repealed needed repealing. Obviously, 29 others, other than myself, thought so, too. Now I understand the fears of threat and intimidation. I understand Senator Bromm's changing his mind because other senators have said I am no longer supporting your bill because you have dared to do this to me, or something to that effect. I support other senators' reasons for making the decisions they have. But I'm very disappointed in them. Going back to what I said, bills should be debated on their merits. If this bill is a good bill, it's a good bill. If you don't want to talk about it, why did you vote for it in the first place? I appreciate the votes that we got yesterday.