

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

March 17, 2003 LB 209

Wahoo, Nebraska, a question or two.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Bromm, would you yield to a question from Senator Chambers?

SPEAKER BROMM: That's the first time I've ever been referred to that way, so I'll be glad to answer.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, Senator Bromm, in the same way that a man who may have dined on bread and water all of his life is entitled to a last meal of his choosing, certainly a senator is entitled to honorific designations before questioning and answering begins. Here is the question I would ask you. The case that you cited and discussed briefly was decided in what year, if you have it listed there?

SPEAKER BROMM: February of 2003.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now that was this year, if I'm not mistaken.

SPEAKER BROMM: That's correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Is that correct? At that time, was there a set of circumstances where an appeal did not stay the imposition of the punishment? At that time, there would be a stay when a person appealed. Is that true?

SPEAKER BROMM: That's correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So at the time that case was filed, and at the time it was decided, the issue we're discussing was not even before the court. Now I am in a position, am I not, to argue that had that been before the court there could have been a different outcome? I could at least argue that and make a plausible presentation of that point. Do you agree that I could make a plausible argument?

SPEAKER BROMM: You could make a plausible argument, Senator Chambers. It would be arguing a different...slightly different set of circumstances.