March 27, 2003   LB 208

lawyer, I don't think, and others who may be lawyers, and others who may not be, are familiar enough with the criminal law to be aware of the fact that a criminal statute cannot be vague, meaning it's unclear what it's trying to tell you. It cannot be over-broad, making things against the law that should not. And it has to clearly tell you what conduct is prohibited and what...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...conduct is not. If a reasonable person reading that statute does not know what conduct is prohibited, the statute is either too vague or over-broad. But it cannot stand. But it certainly cannot stand when by its terms it allows other elements to be a part of the crime which are not stated in the statute. So you cannot say, the crime consists of "1," "2," "3," "4," but is not limited to. Which means the officer or anybody else can add other things. A crime exists only when the Legislature by explicit legislation has made it so. And any supposed criminal statute that does not clearly declare what constitutes the crime is unconstitutional. So that would have to be changed. But that, again, is one of those matters I'm not going to try to amend now. And I'm not going to try to amend it at all,...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...because I want the bill to be unconstitutional. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Bromm on the Kruse amendment to the committee amendments to LB 208.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Mr. President. And after having a chance to understand the amendment to the amendment, I do support this amendment. I want to say that right up front. I think that, providing that this bill moves, I would be willing to spend some time with it to try to understand all sections. I do also have some questions about the aggravated driving under the influence section and what it means. And I know Senator Chambers might have been alluding to some of that as well. If I