

economic versus noneconomic amendment that Senator Kristensen brought up on Friday and was attached to LB 88. There remain two distinct parts of LB 262, one dealt with collateral source which was the amendment that Senator Coordsen brought up on Friday that was voted down by this body. That remained one particular area of the bill and that was brought up by Senator Kristensen this morning and that dealt with the inspection law dealing with municipalities and that was ruled by the Chair as nongermane. So we have dealt, essentially, with all parts of LB 262 and the body has chosen to accept two parts of it. The Chair has decided that one part was nongermane and a third part was voted or the fourth part was voted down by the body. It's a bafflement to me why this bracket motion is being brought before us. The body has considered all parts of LB 262. Would Senator Warner yield to a question, Mr. President?

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Warner, would you yield to a question, please?

SENATOR WARNER: Yes.

SENATOR ABOUD: Senator Warner, is there a fifth part of LB 262 that the body has not considered? Is there additional language in LB 262 that this body has not had the opportunity to debate on the floor?

SENATOR WARNER: That I couldn't answer, Senator Abboud. There...as a matter of fact, the body has already refused, by the fact that it was not germane, to discuss some issues which I think are pertinent to LB 88, so...

SENATOR ABOUD: Thank you, Senator Warner. Maybe if that particular section dealing with municipalities was, in fact, germane, we would have been debating it here on the floor. I know that LB 262 had a fair hearing. LB 262 is still alive in committee and as with a number of bills in Judiciary, we're going to be taking an examination of all of the bills in executive sessions this week, and perhaps that bill might make it out on the floor. But the point is that there were no additional sections that have not been considered by this entire legislative body and in light of that, in the light of the opportunities that we've had to debate all sections of LB 262, and the fact is that this particular bill will have two additional rounds of debate in which a multitude of other issues can be brought in, then I see no reason to vote for this