

and I am even considering not raising it again for the rest of my life. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Don Wesely, please. Okay. Did you wish to close on it, Senator Beutler? The question is the adoption of the Beutler amendment. All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Oh, Senator Cal Carsten, excuse me, I didn't see your light.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Just a minute, Mr. President. Do I understand now that we are again...to be sure I understand the process, we are again today now with this amendment doing the same thing that was attempted yesterday to gut LB 687 and inserting a new bill with his amendment. Is that correct?

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Beutler, would you like to respond to that, please.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Carsten, you used the word "gut" and, of course, that characterizes the operation, but this is not the...this is not what we traditionally know as a gutting operation. I tried to explain on the floor yesterday that this bill was before the Constitutional Revision Committee. However, it happened to be a resolution as opposed to a bill because of the fact that I had originally proposed a constitutional amendment. But it did have a public hearing on the very question before us and the committee simply switched it from the resolution form to the bill form by this mechanism.

SENATOR CARSTEN: May I continue, Mr. President? But, Senator Beutler, as the bill now stands, is it not a Parks bill?

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Beutler, would you respond, please.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Was it not the argument of Senator DeCamp not to kill the bill because he was going to use it for that purpose?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Carsten, my agreement with Senator DeCamp was that he would abandon the bill for his purposes. It was dead in committee and he recognized and acknowledged that and was kind enough to let me use the bill. It was never his intention nor my agreement that he should ever be