

find have been answered. And we believe that the severability clause would be helpful on this bill. I ask your support on returning to Select File and then to attach the severability clause. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Discussion on the motion to return the bill, Senator Nelson, followed by Senator Scofield.

SENATOR NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Senator Smith and her staff and I think I always find my good friend, Jacky, the interests of either the elderly or the children or whoever or whatever may be. That was my concern yesterday when I brought this to the attention of the body. I feel that LB 662 is a very good bill and it does pertain to many programs over and above...for the family and the family units and I didn't want to muddy up, I didn't want to do anything on that bill that would discourage passage or that the original intent of the bill and that is to help families and children. After adjournment yesterday noon, various people more knowledgeable than I, with Bar degrees and so on and so forth, in each and every case told me that this was a concern. And the severability clause was mentioned. There was not full agreement whether that would take care of it or not but I feel that it can't...certainly can't hurt anything in any way, and if it does help to clarify the bill, I certainly hope that you would support Senator Smith's efforts. And, after all, it is the families that we're thinking of and it is the kids and it's not one particular issue at this point that has been added to the bill. So, from the opinions that was given me and, as I say, I feel people more knowledgeable than I, that this certainly is a concern to the bill and the whole bill would then be subject, if it wasn't off of there, subject to court cases and many, many of them and I see no reason to put the states through that kind of money or that kind of problems if it's not necessary. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Scofield.

SENATOR SCOFIELD: Thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate Senator Smith's efforts in bringing this amendment. I think it does get us past what our potential problems if, in fact, they arise in terms of the interpretation of this amendment. I think it's consistent...I think the bill is still consistent with the intent of all of you who have supported the bill, and yet if we run into definitional problems and vague interpretations, I think this perhaps still allows the original intent of the bill