

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

April 1, 2004 LB 1090

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time.

SPEAKER BROMM: And that's what this would be.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time, Senator.

SPEAKER BROMM: And I'm going to propose that whether we adopt the Brashear amendment or not. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Senator Erdman, on the Chambers amendment to the Brashear amendment.

SENATOR ERDMAN: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Legislature. I'm not going to engage in the State Bar Association's discussion, but I would like to ask Senator Brashear a few questions about his amendment, if he would yield.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Will you yield, Senator Brashear.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, Mr. President.

SENATOR ERDMAN: First, Senator Brashear, with the amendment that Senator Chambers has before us, he strikes the word "substantially." The question that I have is, what is the intent of having "substantially equal" and then "substantially unaltered" in the language as far as the money that would be transferred? It would be substantially equal transfers. Why is that language in the amendment?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Senator Erdman, that's used in the intent language section of the amendment in order to allow us, us the state, to come close without being exact. Substantially equal means close counts. Equal is a precise computation.

SENATOR ERDMAN: Okay. So in other words, we don't have to get down to the nickel, we just have to...it would be close? Okay.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Just be substantially close.

SENATOR ERDMAN: The other question that I have is in regards to