

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

April 5, 2005

LB 709

remitted and how that was all taken care of would be something that the argument could be made that is a cost to the provider. Is that not correct?

SENATOR BYARS: There could be additional costs to the provider.

SENATOR ERDMAN: And under your amendment then, that would not be allowed?

SENATOR BYARS: I like that idea. I think you probably should, too, but I think, as I said earlier, the devil is in the details. I want a concept here, no different than what you're asking for in your concept, Senator Erdman, and I think it would be certainly within your scope of thinking broadly, as you've asked all of us to do on this legislation, that this would be an appropriate amendment and you could think broadly enough to include it.

SENATOR ERDMAN: And a final question for Senator Byars. You...and Senator Chambers did point this out. The section that you're amending deals with the purpose of the act, and you continually speak of you want to have intent language in the bill. The intent language is Section 4. The purpose of the act is Section 3. Are you...is your true intent to have...is your true goal to have it in the intent section of what the Legislature intends to accomplish, or is your goal to have it in the section that outlines the basic tenets of the study?

SENATOR BYARS: No, it is my intention to have it in the intent language.

SENATOR ERDMAN: So your amendment then would need to be amending Section 4, which would be page 2, as opposed to page 1, if I'm hearing your answer correctly.

SENATOR BYARS: I have to reread it, Senator Erdman. I can't immediately answer that question.

SENATOR ERDMAN: And while you're reading, let me again...we don't solve the problem if we shift it...