

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

February 11, 2000 LB 1004

those convictions against him, so that's what brings this that we're looking at today before us. This language is so impractical, so impossible of utilization by a court that it ought to be stricken. But not only must the court take judicial notice, see, this doesn't give the court discretion, that's why you're intruding into the realm of the court. You are saying the courts shall, and by saying shall, the court can strike it down and say, you cannot tell us to do things that violate proper judicial action. You cannot order us to take judicial notice of all these statutes and all the amendments that have been made to those statutes; you cannot order us to take judicial notice of the laws of the United States. As Senator Matzke did correctly point out, there are certain things of which a court may take judicial notice. But the court doesn't just take judicial notice because you ask it to, you brief it, and you argue it, and you show that it is something that is not questioned, that the validity of it is readily determinable, and it doesn't require all of this arguing back and forth to establish its validity. And if you can do all those things, the court will take judicial notice, but even then it doesn't have to. This says it must. All the laws of the statutes...I mean all the statutes of other states, the statutes of the United States, any territory subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, and any city or village ordinances enacted pursuant to the law of another state,...

SENATOR COORDSEN: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...the United States or any territory. Do you see what a long train of things are being ordered for the court to do under this language? I'm telling you, and you can reject it if you want to, this might be the perfect time bomb to let stay in the bill. And I will argue to show that this is one of the reasons that people have for voting for the bill, because it's all intermixed. And if this is struck down, the whole bill has to go. And I assure you there are people who will challenge this bill, and they would love to have arguments, of the kind presented by Senator Matzke, offered in defense of this. But I'm giving us the opportunity to review this, to analyze it, and if you agree that it's entirely too broad, that it's trying to dictate how the court shall behave as a court and therefore it's unwise, it ought to be eliminated here instead of you putting it