

March 19, 1990

LB 315

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I would like to ask Senator Coordsen a question.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Coordsen, please.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Coordsen, the reason I'm asking you the question, I thought you might be on the list to speak before I did. How...are you in favor of Senator Ashford's amendment? Would you support it?

SENATOR COORDSEN: I'm in favor of the intent of Senator Ashford's amendment. I don't think the amendment is necessary. The language in my amendment says, "enrolls" not "enters". The intent of this amendment is the same as what Senator Ashford's amendment to the amendment. I really don't think it's necessary. It's an exercise...we disagree on the meaning of words.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Coordsen, so that I can understand what your intent is, are you saying that if a person has applied for one of these programs and it's too full for the person to actually partake in the program at that time, that that application by the person would be sufficient to continue or to allow benefits to be received?

SENATOR COORDSEN: Yes, that's the...that is my intent.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Suppose somebody else, in construing this language, took it to mean that a person is not enrolled in the program until they have actually been entered as a participant. In other words, there might be ambiguity here. I don't think Senator Ashford's amendment would change what you said your intent is but I think it would take away any ambiguity.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Well, of course, this floor debate will take away ambiguity if someone would look it up, too, that we have established the meaning,...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But I think...

SENATOR COORDSEN: ...the intent.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Excuse me. I think what a court might say if