

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

February 20, 2004 LB 906

of the amendment, I missed what you had explained. So, although changing the word "board" to "department" is not very consequential if you understand why it's being done, it may not be crystal-clear just from that change being made as to why it's done.

SENATOR JENSEN: And I understand.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, so I'm clear on that particular aspect and that's all I will ask you. But there are some other questions that have arisen about the bill, not that will cause me to oppose the bill, but since we are, as Senator Stuhr pointed out, cutting new territory, we may as well do it as correctly and thoroughly as we possibly can. So if there are substantive issues that remain,...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...it would be good for us to clear as many of those away as possible and not hasten something onto the books which may not adequately cover the waterfront. The reason I wouldn't want to do that, there may be people who would rely on what we put into the statute and we would come back with changes that may impact on them. But if we can put people on notice of exactly what is entailed in this body art regulation, it would be better to do that. And I'm listening to Senator Bourne, and Senator Jensen's explanations are making it clear why the amendments that are being offered here this morning are being presented. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BROMM PRESIDING

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Stuhr.

SENATOR STUHR: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the body. I have to disagree with Senator Bourne in saying that we are trying to overregulate this industry. I think what we have set up are just really the bare minimum requirements that have been set up for other areas under the Cosmetology Act. As I've said before, we have tried to follow this act very closely, but this is an area that I think is of great concern. Last week I