

SENATOR CHAMBERS: In this case, wouldn't that be what we're doing with 168?

SPEAKER WITHEM: Time. Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Senator Brashear, would you again yield to a couple of questions?

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Brashear.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: And again I'm sitting back thinking about our little conversation of a couple of minutes ago and I have this sense that what you're telling me, and correct me if I'm wrong, that (a) 168 doesn't change anything in the existing law that we have now but it's your sense that since some people feel very strongly you feel that we might as well do it because it doesn't do anything and what the heck. Would that be a fair assessment?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: No, I don't believe that is, Senator Bernard-Stevens. I'm not saying LB 168 doesn't change anything we have in the law now, I'm saying that there is, generally speaking, law on all these subjects and this is, as Senator Chambers and I just dialogued, a specific provision of law relating to the subject matter.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Can you enlighten me then on 168, what in 168 is an addition to and creates something that we do not...that will accomplish something that we currently do not have into law at this time?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Senator, I am not going to claim to have spent a huge amount of time in critical legal analysis of the bill. I was...the way I got into this dialogue was speaking to Senator Chambers' amendment and there may well be a lesson for me there. But what I'm going to say, what we are accomplishing, without doubt, is making a specific public policy statement by this body as to its view of takings and how they ought to be treated and how they ought to be promulgated if we adopt LB 168.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Senator Brashear, a further question. If we had a potential of...if I remember correctly when I asked the Clerk there were six hours debate already on the bill before