

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

March 22, 2000 LB 953

You would be willing still to lose LB 953 in order to leave the amendment in the form that it is now attached to that bill, is that true?

SENATOR VRTISKA: Senator, I would like to see LB 953 pass because of the importance that I think it brings to the work...people in the work force...in the workplace.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I understand that, and I'm not questioning that at all.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Okay.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I know how strongly you feel about that bill.

SENATOR VRTISKA: All right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Do you think any questions as to constitutionality have been raised that trouble you, or do you feel that the whole discussion has not raised a substantive question that ought to trouble anybody?

SENATOR VRTISKA: Senator, the only...the only answer I could give was, and I felt that if that part that you discussed was...could be constitutionally suspect that that could be taken out by the court and the bill would still be valid and it would take care of the problem. Now I'm not a lawyer, as you well know, and so I'm only looking at advice that I've been...handed to me by Counsel saying that if that were...if that part could be removed, then the rest of the bill would remain.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Vrtiska. So what Counsel has told Senator Vrtiska, and what Counsel has told Senator Hilgert is that you can take what we view as a human being, excise the heart and the organism will continue to live. Counsel should give Senator Vrtiska cases saying that a substantive portion of a law can be cut out and the rest will remain. The court has said the opposite. Whenever a provision is essential to the law, and it falls, the whole law falls. If a provision is the motivation for passing a law and that is struck down, the whole law falls. The court has never agreed to rewrite statutes for the Legislature. And for somebody to say