

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

April 7, 2004

LB 692

compelling that would be against doing what Senator Bromm is suggesting. I doubt that there will be many more cases of the kind that has brought this matter to our attention, but there's no way to know. But it's good to make your house wolf-proof before the wolf is on the front doorstep howling. We have a very large wolf at the door, but we don't know if the wolf is going to gobble up everybody inside the house, or is willing to talk to people in the house and say that if you can give me something to substitute for your tender hide, I will let you live and I will munch on something else. What we need to do is plan for the worst. Right now, the state is supreme. People do not expect Presidents, kings or other potentates to conduct their personal lives according to the standards of ordinary people. Maybe they should, but they don't and they cannot because of the kind of responsibilities and obligations they have. They cannot speak truthfully in all circumstances. They cannot be forthcoming always, because there are interests beyond their own that relate to the state, which will transcend any personal inclination one of these leaders, whether called a prince, a king, a princess, a queen, will have to contend with. So the state, as Senator Brashear pointed out the first day that this came up, is the sovereign or the king. The king cannot be sued or moved against without the king's permission. In this case, the state gave its permission in advance to be sued. It then conducted itself in a way that violated the principles it was bound by and was bound to observe. The state was taken to court and lost. Now a judgment is against the state. Senator Bromm's amendment would not reduce that judgment. The interest is not a part of the judgment. If a final decision had been made and there was no litigation which could be undertaken, then I would have a different attitude about not exempting out this particular case. But it is still ongoing so I do not see any legal impediment to doing what Senator Bromm's amendment would seek to do. I think, for myself, I need to do some more thinking and evaluating, which cannot be done before we take a vote on his amendment.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So I'm going to do the thing that I think is going to hold the state harmless at this point and vote to adopt