

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

April 8, 2004

LB 958

came here, was to spend this day on Senator Foley's bill. I declared that at the beginning and everybody has more or less accepted it. There is no groundswell for us to do anything other than give Senator Foley a chance to have his bill debated. And I think it's clear that even if I would roll over now just to let the bill move to Select File so other things could be dealt with, I would attack it with a vengeance on Select File, and every other bill on Select File too. So that's what we're confronted with. We didn't even need to meet today since LB 958 was the first thing confronting us, but we did meet and we ought to have met. Notice I say we didn't need to but we ought to. There was an obligation for us to meet. There is an obligation for us to give Senator Foley's bill the consideration to which it's entitled, as would any other bill which holds priority status. Unfortunately, we won't give it the fate that I think it's entitled to and so richly deserves. But to show that I'm taking it more seriously than anybody else, I've offered amendments. Some of them may seem unserious, but if you look at them you will see that there is a very significant point being made. I do not believe we ought to draft a criminal statute which prosecutors are required under the law to enforce, but on its very face the statute cannot be enforced. A prosecutor cannot enforce it. And you all call that good legislating? This is what Senator Friend wants. He wants the Legislature to take back its prerogatives, among which is the prerogative to pass stupid legislation, because he said yesterday if all 48 would admit they're stupid then I'd probably go away, so this is a reflection of stupid legislation. Why, I would ask Senator Friend, but not on my time, (singing) you have the right to speak your mind but not on my time.

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, why, this is rhetorical, would we try to pass a criminal statute that everybody will admit cannot be enforced? If you want the statute to address a perceived evil, why don't you tailor the statute to deal with the evil in a practical way? Senator Foley and Senator Maxwell talked about being practical and pragmatic. Why don't you apply that to the crafting of this statute? Thank you, Mr. President.