

merit. Then when it comes out on the floor, due to a lot of my pushing publicly and behind the scenes and other things and say I may not answer a question on it. If I have confidence in the validity of it and the legitimacy of it, I would agree to answer any question that was asked in reference to it but I think this begins to give you an idea of the kind of matter that we are dealing with here today and I am going to make a comment about section 2 without offering an amendment. It has to do with that talking about being "accessory to the crime" and it starts again on page 13 and I am going to read skipping portions so that you can get the sense of it. "A person is guilty of being an accessory to crime if with intent to interfere with...apprehension,...he: (f) By force...obstructs anyone in the performance of any act which might aid in...apprehension." Now a person could be placing an illegal and unlawful act to bring about apprehension. Based on this carefully constructed bill which has been worked on for seven years by a former Supreme Court judge, his highly competent legal colleagues, Senator Luedtke and other lawyers, we have a provision in statute which would make you an accessory to the crime based on the language of the bill if you interfered with the placing of an illegal act. Now if what I am saying is not true, let them show that the language of the bill contradicts what I am saying. And as far as the comment by Senator DeCamp yesterday that Senator Barnett as a layman is the best person to present this bill, that is patently false and untrue. Senator Barnett due to being Chairman of the Judiciary Committee has been put in a position which I feel is untenable and unfair. This is a legal bill. It is a lawyers' bill. It is a special interest bill par excellence and per se. To ask Senator Barnett to explain legal terms when he has no training in the handling of those legal terms I think is unjust and improper. As I said yesterday, I am not going to offer any amendments to this bill but, periodically, I am going to ask rhetorical questions and I will not give Senator Luedtke the opportunity to insult me on the floor by refusing to answer a question when it is our practice to answer questions that relate to our bills so I will not address any questions to Senator Luedtke. It may seem like a game but it is not one and my questions, as I say again, will be for the record and to indicate the travesty that is being run past the Legislature by the handling of the bill in the fashion that it is being dealt with.

SENATOR MARVEL: If there is not further discussion on Article II, we shall proceed to Article III.

SPEAKER LUEDTKE: I am not going to let that last line pass. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I indicated to Senator Chambers that I would see when he asked a question whether I was going to answer it. In many instances Senator Chambers' questions have nothing to do with the bill at all and I would so say and so indicate and that is why I answered the way I did. I stand ready to answer any legitimate question regarding LB 38 or any other bill but I am not going to stand up here and be cross-examined and put in the position of being a judicial officer and interpreting the laws that we are passing because that is not our object. We are here to pass laws and then they will be interpreted by another