

medical practice occur in the state as it relates to nurse practitioners, there is precious little disagreement. But when you got to what are the words on the piece of paper and how will they be interpreted at the Attorney General's office and the rules and regs, that's where the real concern...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SPEAKER WITHEM: ...comes about. And I think we're very close at this point to reaching a consensus that will allow the concerns of the medical community to be met, the ability of nurse practitioners to practice within the realm of their training, and most importantly for the people of the state to be able to access another alternative for delivery of medical care; and I think we'll have a good bill before us. If you have any questions of me, I'd be happy to respond to them.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Withem. Senator Avery would like to announce that the following guests are visiting the Legislature. His aunt and uncle are here, Janet and Clayton Shelsta from Hayti, South Dakota, are both here under the north balcony. Will you both stand and be recognized, please. Welcome to the Nebraska Legislature. Senator Bernard-Stevens to speak to the Wesely amendment.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Madam President. Senator Wesely, if you'd give a little bit broader explanation of what the contradiction was, going back to the amendment offered by Senator Day last session. You mentioned that it accidentally deleted portions of what was LB I think you said 900. What I'd like to have you do just a little bit if you don't mind is state what was that portion of 900, what was deleted, and why we should correct that portion of it. My sense, my memory tells me it's not a problem at all, but I think it would be nice to remind people of what that was. If they don't want to, at least I would like to be reminded.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Madam President. I appreciate the question, Senator Bernard-Stevens. There's been some confusion about what the amendment is. It's a carry-over amendment from last year. What we found in the drafting is that there wasn't a proper reference back to a bill that we had passed the year