

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

May 3, 1999

LB 382

if he or she or they will have a greater amount of strength than the other will simply impose a deal by saying this is the way it's going to be. Take it or leave it. I believe the Revenue Committee imposed the deal in that fashion. I think the Revenue Committee said take this or leave it. And those who support this bill were so happy to get anything on the floor that they took it. They could vote to reject all the committee amendments which they won't. I don't know how many people may have read every word in that green copy other than myself. I don't mean just skimmed it. Oh, I saw so many traps and pitfalls in it and now all that studying was for naught. But then I come to the work of the geniuses...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...and I feel I'm in even better shape because they had the example of that green copy as what...as to what not to do in drafting a bill and then they give us this. Right now I am nibbling around the edges with the amendments that I'm offering. But it's to show that in every area of this bill, even in the so-called findings, there are things that are problematic. They ought to be corrected. But again, look at my motive. My intent is to kill this bill. If you vote for this amendment, it will be a step in that direction. It will improve the bill and, therefore, assist me in killing it.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Chambers, your light is next and this will be your third time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: My third time or my close?

SENATOR CUDABACK: I'm sorry, Senator Chambers, it is your closing time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, and I just...I don't want to take anything I'm not entitled to because I have ways of getting all of the time that I need, and I intend to do that. Why does it matter what we put in legislative findings? What difference does it make? Well, courts have differing views about legislative history. If the legislation itself is clear, there is no need for the court to construe or interpret the language. The court can take the language as it is written. But if there