

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

March 29, 2000 LB 1167

question you had, Senator Crosby. Section 36 says, "Nothing in the Court Appointed Special Advocate Act affects the attorney-client privilege." I think what that really addresses is a fact that if a client talks to an attorney that is subject to the privilege. If a third party is present that waives the privilege. And I think the reason that this is in here is to provide that the presence of a CASA worker in that conversation would not waive the attorney-client privilege so that those communications would still be privileged communications. And that I think is the...really the full answer to your question. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Matzke. We are debating the amendment, AM2915, the Suttle amendment to the committee amendments. Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Thank you, Mr. President. I hope that the members of the body are patient with us. We are obviously trying to read and draft at the same time and discuss with Senator Suttle and you what the important issue is here before us and how we might remedy the language so that, in the amendment, so that it might address some concerns. And, again, I will state that my concern is that you should never, in my opinion, have a person who is not trained and licensed to practice law appointed as a guardian ad litem, and I would not distinguish between a guardian ad litem for a child as opposed to a guardian ad litem for an elder, because in cases you can have a guardian ad litem appointed for someone who is older. Guardian ad litem are appointed in a variety of context and I don't think anybody in those other context, in particular, would say that anyone should be appointed as a guardian ad litem who was not trained, licensed and authorized to practice law. So that is really what we are attempting to get at with the amendment that he had filed. It does appear that we've overlooked a sentence at the bottom of page 4, which would continue to make references to a co-guardian ad litem, so that the amendment that is on file would have to be reformed with a substitute amendment that would also take out the last sentence at the bottom of page 4 to remove all references to guardian ad litem. I believe if we did that then the amendment would stand for the proposition that a volunteer could be appointed as a friend of the court but only as a friend of the court, and