

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

April 15, 1999 LB 835

packer, I would try to use this language to attack the entirety of the statute without a severability clause on the basis of vagueness and render it unenforceable and inapplicable. If I were an enforcer, I might try to use it for the purposes I previously discussed.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But if the packer's already prohibited under Initiative 300 from doing that, that...

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...we're talking about, the packer wouldn't raise the issue.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Schmitt.

SENATOR SCHMITT: I would yield my time to Senator Chambers, so he can continue his conversation with Senator Brashear.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Schmitt.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Brashear, I was speaking rapidly because I knew we only had a minute. Now I can do it in a more leisurely manner. The packer, in order to challenge this statute on the basis of vagueness, would have to argue that, in reading this statute, he or she does not know what is prohibited. Isn't that true? Isn't that what vagueness...isn't that the basis of a vagueness argument?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: That's one of the bases of the vagueness argument, since there's a criminal penalty attached, and you're right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now, what do you think in this language would lead a packer to challenge this statute? What, in other words, would a packer be attempting to do that currently is lawful which he thinks this statute would prevent him from doing?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: If I was a...