

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

March 13, 1997 LB 422

have known they were public servants, they have to know or should have known they were performing their official duties. And so at some point, and this is not the time, we'll need to discuss that some more, if you will. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Before continuing with the debate, the Legislature has some guests and they are under the south balcony. Venette Cornils from Bushnell, Jo Bourlier from Kimball, Jo Baltensperger from Bushnell, and Dema Nachtigal from Kimball. Would you all please stand up and be recognized and welcomed by your Legislature. Thank you for being here. Senator Matzke, on the amendment to the amendment.

SENATOR MATZKE: Madam President and members of the Legislature, I want to address Senator Chambers' amendment to his amendment. I think, Senator Chambers, I'll have to take the position on this, I've seen you take it so many times. I think it is an improvement on a bad amendment. I think you have done a fine job of defining what should be meant by the word "exist". And I appreciate the fact that you have done so in both the singular and the plural, I think that your definition is good. So I'm going to do what I've seen you do so many times, maybe I'm learning by your example, I'll support a good amendment to a bad amendment. It improves what I'm ultimately going to ask this body to vote against because again, and I guess I have three things to say. First of all, it isn't necessary for us to put this language, which I agree with you, is very vital to the constitutionality of the statute. It isn't necessary to put that into law. Secondly, we don't know what the future is going to hold so far as future cases the Supreme Court are going to have to consider, and this is would put them in a straitjacket, and thirdly, and I've just come to this conclusion, that any language that we add to these very sensitive statutes is going to cause additional litigation, it's going to give lawyers on both sides of these issues something new to talk about. And I think that the court has done a good job in refining and limiting the effect of this, as you've pointed out. But any time we add any language to this, especially to 1(d), which is probably the most sensitive circumstance listed in the statute, I think you'd probably agree that this is the critical circumstance in this statute. Any time we add any language to it we're just inviting additional court cases, additional