

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

April 15, 1999 LB 835

LB 835. And I...and, again, my effort here, if I can figure out a way to improve the bill, to zero in and crystallize what it is we're trying to do, I'm going to do that. Once we've done that, it's up to you to decide whether you support it or whether you don't. But at least...and as these things work through three...three discussions on the floor, sometimes we're able to see those things more clearly and it wasn't obvious to me on General File what we needed to do there but I had a significant feeling we need to do something. And so I would...I filed the amendment. I'll try and get copies made and circulated. I apologize for the lateness of the filing, but I cannot support the Brashear amendment for the reasons that I've stated and...but I'm certainly willing to talk to Senator Brashear and try to...to find solutions. So thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Additional discussion, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, remember, I had said if something was to be done it would be better to follow Senator Bromm's approach than Senator Brashear's. But here's what you need to keep in mind. The more verbiage or words you put into this section, this Section 4, the more you open it to interpretation. If you use the word "temporary," that allows interpretation. What does that mean? The word "incidental," what does that mean? Here is the way I'm looking at it, and you can accept it or not. Before a provision of statute comes before the court, somebody has to bring some challenge to it. If, as Senator Brashear says, the constitutional provision already prohibits what we're talking about in Section 4, no packer is going to do something in violation of the constitution, we would presume, but obviously some are and the Attorney General will not do anything about it. Here is now what I want Senator Brashear to listen to, and I want my colleagues who are supporting LB 835 to hear. I have read many cases dealing with how the courts interpret and construe statutes. I've been involved in legal action of my own initiation that required interpretation of statutes, and I have won. Here's what the court says. It's going to begin by taking words to have their ordinary common meaning. Then it's going to construe those words, if a construction is necessary, to carry out the expressed will of the Legislature, it's not going to