

technical. So I had to change it and to remove that motion and that is the reason that it was done this way. I had filed it. It was in the last few minutes before twelve o'clock to reconsider, and the legal expertise helped me out on this and said, no, Arlene, you must file as I did. And by that time it got to be twelve o'one, and it was then not filed, my second handling of it, and I hope that is an explanation to the body.

PRESIDENT MOUL: I am going to rule that Senator Nelson's amendment to the amendment is in order. Senator Lamb.

SENATOR LAMB: Well, Madam Chair, nobody is perfect, the ruling was wrong but I will not challenge it.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Lamb. We will proceed with debate on the amendment to the amendment by Senator Nelson. I will recognize senators wishing to speak on that issue, Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, I have sent out for your reading this morning copies of two news items that describe the action here yesterday. The item in the World-Herald particularly doesn't tell you anything about what really happened, nor does it tell you anything about the original content of the bill, nor the committee amendments, nor the progress of the action on the floor yesterday. So for those of you who might not have been on the floor, did not know what took place, I would hope that you would just listen very carefully. The committee amendments thoroughly gut LB 67. The Lamb amendment does give just a wee bit of direction to the committee amendments. The committee amendments do not in any way outline any of the problems that need to be addressed as I outlined in the original bill. What really should be done here, Senator Nelson, if you want to do the generous and graceful and courageous act would be to put a kill motion on LB 67 because the bill will be nothing. It will mean nothing at all no matter whether we adopt your amendment, whether we adopt the committee amendments because from that point forward the bill means nothing. It, in effect, gives the cities and the villages two and a half years, two years and ten months to come up with a plan. It does not provide any penalty, if they don't have a plan. It does not provide any deadline for the submission of a plan prior to December 15th of 1993, so that if 225 villages and cities come to DEC with a plan on December 15th of 1993, and it is not acceptable, there isn't any direction in the amendment as