

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

April 13, 1999 LB 729

concerned about that. All it does is, I assume that it would test it says it's properly worded or whatever, I don't know what the terms, but it looks maybe there is room here for something to flesh out what should be and there should be a statement. I don't know if you have any comment. You're welcome to comment, if you'd like, now.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank...thank you, Senator Wehrbein. Are you suggesting that the petition should have language on it to that effect?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Well, I...as I remember, we toyed with this in the last one on putting on a petition that paid circulators versus unpaid or something like that, and I think it was discounted. Didn't we originally talk about having a stamp, a red stamp saying...?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Right, that is...that is current provision of law.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Yeah, and what this would say on this...this petition has neither been approved or disapproved by the Supreme Court or simply, I don't, I don't have the language right at my fingertips as to what might be said, but something to be sure that there was no implication of approval or disapproval as the circulator was able to do it. It would say right on the petition something to that effect so there could not be an implied approval to the people that the Supreme Court has looked at this because I can even hear someone say, a petitioner say, well, the Supreme Court says this is okay. Well, they are only maybe approving the language or whatever but they are not approving the intent of the...the intent of the bill or the intent of the petition.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: They're, when the Supreme Court acts, they are not saying necessarily this would be good public policy. They're saying this meets the constitutional standards...

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Um-hmm.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: ...and the legal sufficiency grounds. That's all they're saying.