

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

April 20, 1999 LB 637

to carry it out. And if costs were involved, the political subdivision would have to raise the money. I think this amendment, despite its instructional purposes, is superfluous, I think it would clutter the amendment Senator Bohlke is offering, and I think it is not necessary at all. Cliches that are created from time to time generally leave me cold. One of those is "a work in progress". But this bill is exactly that. What Senator Bohlke is offering by way of an amendment is not the final word. It's a step in a process. The first thing to do is to get rid of all of this material that is in LB 637. We have a wound, and Senator Dierks could probably go into more detail on something like this, but we want to clean out all of the infection, we want to make the wound as sterile as we possibly can. After we get through clearing away all of that infected tissue, we're going to apply some form of antiseptic that will have some healing properties, but will also keep infection from reoccurring. So by striking everything from LB 637, we remove the infected and infectious material. We then offer Senator Bohlke's amendment, which is in the nature of an antiseptic. But that doesn't do all that needs to be done. We may have to do a bit of surgery,...

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...we may have to do a bit of suturing, but we have to take it a step at a time. We will perform this aspect of the work, let the healing take place between now and Select File, then we will take the next step in the process by dealing with Senator Janssen's addition. So I'm opposed to Senator Brown's amendment.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Brown. Senator Brown waives off. Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Mr. President, members of the body, I have a couple of questions. First of all, Senator Bohlke, on the original motion of yours,...

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Bohlke.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: ...it says, if I have it right, it would strike all the original provisions and amendments thereto of the