

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

April 1, 2003 LB 265

not only be negligent but reckless in his or her disregard for the requirements of the law, so do you think that there should be blanket and total immunity, as the bill gives now? Or should there be some language that qualifies this immunity and starts by putting a requirement on the sheriff to exercise due care and comply with the requirements of the bill?

SENATOR TYSON: Well, first of all, Senator Chambers, let me state that I believe that Section 9 is sufficient to itself because you may be in the habit of but I am not in the habit of playing "what if" in some enumerable cases of suppositions. What if everybody in the courthouse...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, well, you've...you've answered...you've answered my...

SENATOR TYSON: ...were corrupt?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...you've answered my question. You think there is no need for amendment.

SENATOR TYSON: That's right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'd like to ask Senator Brashear a question, Mr. President, if he will respond.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Would you yield, Senator Brashear, to a question from Senator Chambers?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, Mr. President.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Brashear, could you turn to page 7, starting in line 26.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: I have it. Thank you.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: There is nothing in this language of Section 9, which is what I'm discussing, that requires the sheriff to comply with the law in issuing this permit. No language says the sheriff shall issue the permit in compliance with the law. Yet, it grants the sheriff total immunity, even