

committee could handle it as well as any other one but the Judiciary Committee has suffered through a hearing on this bill. We have discussed it at length and the only accord that could be reached really was to put it out here in the form that it was introduced, LB 316 that is. So if you send it back to committee I think it would not accomplish anything worthwhile. Your ultimate intent I think is good, Senator Koch, of trying to get a decent, correct bill but that is not going to happen whether that bill goes through the committee again or slides across this floor on the greased skids that we see before us this morning. So I would have to reluctantly oppose Senator Koch's motion.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Senator Koch, I apologize. I apologize for trying to get all sides to give their input and try to resolve the matter in what I felt was a reasonable way. I apologize for trying to save months, weeks of confusion here on the floor in which mostly it gets down to name calling as to who is murderers and who is whatever, lunatics, nuts, whatever they want to call them. I said in the paper or I said to some reporter which you are quoting, quite out of context I might add, that the original bill as introduced needed major modifications. It was unconstitutional as it was introduced. I pointed out it was the discussion vehicle so that we could address all of the subjects. Now you said it is just terrible, criminal and everything else for us to pass legislation that might be vulnerable, your words, to court decision. You tell me what cotton picking piece of legislation you ever passed here that isn't subject to court decisions and interpretations. That is what we are about, passing what we believe is right, getting it into a form we think is right and that is why we have courts in case one side or another disagrees. In this case I specifically recited on the floor and said, "In those areas where there is legitimate concern and disagreement, where there might be unconstitutionality still but where it still has to be addressed by the court, we are trying to get it into shape so it can go there." Now if you think that is so doggone dumb, why don't you suggest something? Your idea is let's just write something that is just absolutely constitutional. Well we can do that. We just don't write nothing, do we? We just don't even write anything and that is what the situation is now, nothing on the books, no abortion laws. If that is what you want, Senator Koch, go to it but I don't think that is what the majority want and, Senator Chambers, the people with the whips in the