

it 15 hoops. Senator DeCamp mentioned the 407 process. This bill as it was originally drafted would make LB 407 process look like a cake walk. The Lynch amendment as it is proposed, even though there are portions that members of the body disagree with, and I think that that was discussed with the Johnson amendment, it is much better as far as I am concerned in terms of what was originally proposed by Senator Lynch in the original bill. If we don't adopt this, the hoops or the process as proposed would not even let a legislator introduce a bill. At least 407, the bill was introduced and then you went about the means to get it processed. In this case, the bill could not even be introduced unless we adopt this amendment without going through a series of social and economic decision-making processes that I don't think anyone could possibly meet the requirements that are established. So whether or not you agree with the mandating of benefits in the discussion that has just previously followed, the Lynch amendment as it is proposed currently is a far cry better than the bill in its original form. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator DeCamp, please, then Senator Marsh.

SENATOR DECAMP: Mr. President, just to clear up a few things. Senator Hall raised the question about he was one of the ones that introduced mandated coverage and he is quite correct, and there have been any number of others starting with...I think the first one that I recall introducing and trying to force the mandated coverage of alcohol down everybody's throat, my recollection the first major attempt on that was by a foolish young legislator about, oh, 15 years ago named DeCamp, and so I am familiar with the issue, and it has been introduced every year since then in one form or another and by one individual or another, and a number of other mandated things. There have been more mandated things introduced the last couple of years than you can believe. Senator Hall was correct when he says this would make the 407 process look like a cake walk except for one thing where he is wrong. Ultimately all it would take would be 25 votes to change it. The same votes it would take to pass the mandated coverage could repeal this law or amend it or force your mandated thing. So in a sense this becomes, it becomes a political statement. It isn't even exactly as strong as Gramm-Rudman where something happens automatically but it is an attempt to say no more mandated coverage unless it is just really