

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

March 17, 2003 LB 209

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But would it not be saying that under the current state of the law, the filing of appeal prevents the dropping of the hammer? But if this were in place, then if the hammer were dropped inappropriately or unjustly, the person would have been punished, as though he or she were guilty, before a final determination by the court. That would be a valid argument, wouldn't it?

SPEAKER BROMM: Well, not entirely, because the person would have the right to request a stay. They would have a right to have the court consider all of the facts and circumstances to determine whether they should be given a stay. So it wouldn't be an automatic situation. There would be consideration.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That would be under your amendment. Under the current law...

SPEAKER BROMM: Well, even under...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...as soon as...go ahead.

SPEAKER BROMM: Excuse me.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'm sorry.

SPEAKER BROMM: Even under LB 209, as it's proposed, there would be an opportunity to apply for a stay. And as you and I discussed the other day, you were quite concerned that that would be a very difficult burden for the...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But what I want to do right now, Fred Astaire, is to end the tap-dancing and deal with the law as it stands right now. Under the law right now, as soon as I perfect an appeal, that stays the imposition of the punishment. Is that true under the law right now?

SPEAKER BROMM: That's true, but I'd rather talk about the next dance.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I know you'd rather talk about the next dance. That's why it takes me to hold your feet the fire and