

already accountable in doing what it's supposed to do so what can it hurt. I'm not going to support this amendment. I think the redundancy in this case is good and I am aware of some cases where not all of these ADA requirements have been carried out. If it doesn't make or break the bill and DPI is already doing it, then the amendment itself doesn't do any good. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator. The Chair recognizes Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President, I would like to resume my discussion with Senator Maurstad, if he would be so obliging.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Maurstad.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Maurstad, what does the term "redundant" mean in the context of the question you asked me?

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Repetitive with little value.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: With little value or no value?

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Little value.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: In what way is the reference in this statute to the ADA redundant when, as Senator Wesely pointed out, it is not repeated anywhere else in Nebraska statutes?

SENATOR MAURSTAD: The intent of the amendment is redundant.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No, no, we're not talking about intent. We're talking about the language. You said this language is redundant. Now let's not interpret it.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: No, what I said was...I didn't make any statement relative to the language. I asked you a question relative to the redundancy of this amendment.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So when you referred to the amendment you were not talking about the language in which it is expressed.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: I'm talking about the intent.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Tell me how the intent then is redundant.