

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

April 10, 2000 LB 1279

who have a permanent physical disability who have lost all mobility". You're saying they have the permanent disability and they've lost mobility. But when you put "or" plus the word "who" it makes it crystal clear that you're talking about two different items. This is a disjunctive construction. Each one stands alone. Individuals who have a permanent physical disability would qualify, or those who have lost all mobility such as to preclude the locomotion, that's the way I believe a court would interpret it. And the court would tell these senators, who want to say, well, that's not what we meant, the court is not interested in that. I have read numerous cases and, obviously, from some of these discussions, I've read and digested them better than other lawyers on the floor. The court will not routinely refer to legislative history. The court says when the language of the law is unambiguous, there is no need to resort to legislative history, because the law says what it means and it means what it says. When the word "or" appears, somebody can go to the dictionary, if they don't know how that word is to be construed. And you notice how people mocked President Clinton when he said, it depends on what the meaning of "is" is, and they laughed and mocked. Well, you-all are talking about, well, it depends on what the meaning of "or" is. We know what "or" means. If you said, the one who is going to get this apple is Senator Aguilar or Senator Baker, that doesn't mean both of them will get the apple and you'll split it; it means one's going to get the apple and if not that one then the other. This word is disjunctive. And the fact that they put not only the word "or" but "who" indicates they're talking about two different bases for qualifying. The person can either have the permanent physical disability or have lost all mobility.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: What is being discussed here now is not the way the law will be construed by a court, but the policy decision and the fact that the legislators voted for something that they didn't understand, or now they've come to believe that it's unwise. And that's why courts construe laws and not the Legislature. The law means what it says in the book; not what it means or what it says in legislative history, unless you cannot, by reading the language, divine what was meant. The courts try to uphold a law and they'll do whatever is reasonable