

what we are doing now. But I think we are kind of caught in a dilemma right now. I think we have to get on with LB 3, get it passed. We don't have the votes to repeal it. We don't have the votes to override a Governor's veto and we can't leave 999 in the shape it's in today. So we have to get this passed. All the amendments that we are getting here is keeping all of us here a little longer and I am getting a little bit, a little bit impatient with just sitting here and listening to the rhetoric trying to patch up something that isn't going to do anything in the best of cases. I suggest that we get on with LB 3 the way it has been acceptable to most members here, get it passed, then come back in January and address the issue again. But we are certainly not getting any place today and I think it's time for us to get on with it so we can get home Thursday. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Nelson, please.

SENATOR NELSON: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I, too, agree with Senator Remmers. I think this bill is by all means not perfect, but for us to add any more to it or to do anything today, we are between a rock and a hard spot on LB 999 and I think, including myself, and I think I can speak for others, would have just as soon had it repealed. But I don't think the votes are there and I think we must move on and do the best we can with this bill today. Thanks.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Thank you, Senator Nelson. Senator Chambers, would you like to close. Senator Chambers, your light is on if you need more than your closing, you...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I will close now.

SPEAKER NICHOL: All right, thank you.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I can understand Senator Remmers and Senator Nelson's expression of impatience but I didn't introduce the bill. I didn't call us into special session. The issue, whether we like it or not, is properly before us and I perceive my obligation as a legislator differently than others perceive theirs. So I am sure when we come back into session in January they will have bills that I might feel impatient with because I don't have the same stake in them that they do. However, when we were dealing with LB 1 this morning, which is a bill I think both of them favored, they expressed no objection or quibbling with the intent language which is in that bill. I am offering intent language for this