

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Brashear. Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body, Senator Brashear, would you yield to a couple questions as well?

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Brashear, Senator Bernard-Stevens would like to have you respond to a question or two.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, Senator.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Senator Brashear, I was just going to take off a little bit from where you're going on the Chambers amendment and I would concur with you that the Chambers amendment doesn't do a great deal and I think I heard you say that maybe we should just go ahead and support it by acclamation and then move on. But then I go back...

SENATOR BRASHEAR: I believe the Chambers amendment to be the law today.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Correct, correct, which brings me to LB 168. What is there in 168 that you feel is substantially different than what the law already is today?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Well, Senator Bernard-Stevens, I was only speaking to the amendment. I was just trying to deal with the matter before...

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Right, right, but I'm dealing now with what you stated on the amendment to the bill. The bill, as I read it, has a lot of nice language of what the intent and what we'd like to see but it doesn't change anything in the law that we already have today. So if the amendment that you're talking about, Senator Chambers, is relatively insignificant one way or the other because it doesn't change existing law, why are we taking so much time on 168 that doesn't change anything in existing law?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Because this far it appears to be the will of at least some members of the body to deal with this issue. They don't see it the way you have just stated it.