

September 29, 1992 LB 20

So I don't think we could have gone that long. We got 4 million out of it, on this compromise. We back off, we amend the amendment, the compromise is gone, and we don't save the 4 million unless we're willing to be here. And, Senator Haberman, if I have your assurance and everybody else's that we are willing to be here, then it's something you look at. But at this point I just don't know that that's going to happen. I intend to oppose the Lamb amendment and I intend to support the Chambers amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Lindsay. Senator Horgan, did you wish to address the Lamb amendment?

SENATOR HORGAN: Briefly, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Lamb amendment. I think what it does is it says that we are not making promises into the future, that we are cutting the budget, that we're cutting this program, and that that cut, until the Legislature either has more money or wants to readdress that program, that that cut will remain in place, and that we will continue to fund this program in the last trimester of the pregnancy. And I think that makes good public sense. And I think Senator Lamb has offered a good amendment, because I don't think in 1995, when there are likely to be 20 or more new senators on this floor, that we ought to be committing them to spending dollars that may not be there. And I think Senator Lamb's amendment is an appropriate thing to do, and I think we ought to adopt it. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Horgan. Senator Haberman. Anyone else wishing to speak to the Lamb amendment? Seeing no one, Senator Lamb, do you wish to close?

SENATOR LAMB: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I guess I'm a bit puzzled by Senator Lindsay's comments in that he's afraid this filibuster would go on forever. I certainly am willing to stay here. However, due to Senator Moore, we have cloture now. And as I understand it that would...the eight hours has passed, and with 33 votes we could close off debate without further amendments, and the bill could be voted on. So his argument that debate may go on forever, really, doesn't make a lot of sense to me because we do have the cloture rule at this point. What we're building in here is a future bombshell that probably, you know, will automatically come back into operation. We're saying for the immediate present we will cut the budget. But then without any further action by this body, then the benefits