

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

February 2, 1999 LB 64

not. Basically, this exception deals with learned treatises, and it's very, very short. On page 5 of the bill, it's only a few lines. It says, statements contained in published treatises, periodicals, or pamphlets on a subject of history, medicine, or other science or art, established as a reliable authority by the testimony or admission of the witness or by other expert testimony or by judicial notice, to the extent called to the attention of an expert witness upon cross-examination or relied upon by the expert witness in direct examination. If admitted, the statements may be read into evidence but may not be received as exhibits. The big thing here, again, is the last sentence. It says, if admitted, the statements may not be read...may be read into evidence but may not be received as exhibits. So if you have an expert, they say that smoking is good for you, and you have a ton of learned treatises here and studies that, boy, smoking is bad for you, you can say, well, what about these? Currently, the expert can say, well, those are all meaningless. This would give you the ability to help seek out the truth and say, well, and read these into the record that there is a difference of opinion here. The actual treatises, again, would not be received as exhibits. Senator...Speaker Kristensen had some questions regarding this. I will say this, to my knowledge, and I've asked the individuals who I have been working with on this bill, there is no case presently pending that is the motivation of the introduction of this bill. The only thing that this bill does is conform and mirrors the federal rules of evidence. And with that, Mr. President, I would yield my time to Mr. Kris...Senator Kristensen, should he have any further questions or would want to discuss this further.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you. Senator Kristensen.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Hilgert, and I know a number of people, if you think that talking about abandoned vehicles are bad, the discussion of hearsay will even drive you crazier, and so I will try not to delve into asking Senator Hilgert what the definition of hearsay is because I'd like to keep him as a friend. But suffice it to say, we are talking about the rules of evidence in a civil case, not a criminal case, civil case. And the issue is, there are certain statements in court that are made that are excluded