

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

March 9, 2004 LB 906

amendments. Because if it were to be challenged in court, the court would say, they had the opportunity to amend it, so their comments won't carry as much weight as their having filled in the gaps that they say exist because they had the opportunity to do so and chose not to.

SENATOR BOURNE: I agree with that statement. And what will happen if the law is challenged, if the court can't determine what the law means by its plain meaning, or if a department, in implementing regulations, can't ascertain by the plain meaning of the law, then they look to the history. Is that right?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Generally speaking, that's true.

SENATOR BOURNE: So an individual who wanted to draft proper legislation would make it as concise and narrow as possible. Is that accurate as well?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right, and as clear.

SENATOR BOURNE: So that there would be little room for questioning or using judgment or subjectivity as it relates to what exactly does this mean.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right. Because the worst of all possibilities is to have a requirement in place and two reasonable people can look at it and arrive at different conclusions as to what it means.

SENATOR BOURNE: Exactly. Thank you. Can I direct your attention to Section 25, subsection (2)(d) on page 13?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'm with you now.

SENATOR BOURNE: And maybe this isn't the appropriate time to discuss this while we're actually...I'm looking at a different section of the bill that doesn't relate to your amendment. Would you prefer that we wait, or continue?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No, because my amendment is so easily understood and there's no disagreement, I think we ought to