

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...I wanted to reduce it even more, but I had to take, as I say, what I could get.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Coordsen. Any further discussion of the Chambers amendment? Seeing none, Senator Chambers, would you like to close? Closing is waived. The question before the body is the adoption of the Chambers amendment to LB 830. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote nay. Please record.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 0 nays, Madam President, on the adoption of Senator Chambers' amendment.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: The Chambers amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, anything further on the bill?

CLERK: Madam President, the next amendment I have is by Senator Wickersham. (Wickersham amendment, EA58, appears on page 842 of the Legislative Journal.)

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Wickersham.

CLERK: Senator, this is your amendment that reads, on page 12 of the Select File version, on lines 20 through 26 and on page 17, strike subsection (7) on lines 3 through 7.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Yes, thank you, Mr. Clerk. And I'm sorry to postpone the debate for the body. This amendment strikes two provisions in the bill which I think...I guess I would characterize them as usurpers, and at the same time I would characterize them as usurpers, I would say that they are perfectly meaningless and useless. If those sound like contradictory terms, maybe I'll be able to explain myself. Section 8 and Section 9...or Section 7 that are being stricken both employ language that I believe was inserted, and maybe somebody will educate me, I believe was inserted to make more difficult a review of decisions by a court. That's the reason that you see the words "considered as determined by law" repeated several times in those provisions. Those are really the key words, "considered as determined by law". Normally, that kind of language would be used in reference to a court decision, a decision by judges. And as it was decided by