

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

April 26, 2005      LB 40

able to work something out, so let's forget the compensation. Do you think somebody at some point perhaps could...that it would be a good idea to have somebody at some point review some of these statutes?

SENATOR REDFIELD: I would agree. However, every time that I have looked at something and tried to construct in a very simple English syntax, I find that the attorneys say, oh no, in legalese you need to do it thus and so. So I would expect that someone with legal training would also be required, not just someone who understands the English language well.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. And that's why somebody like myself would probably be perfect. Kipling had talked about somebody who had walked with kings and not lost their virtue, or walked with ordinary people and not lost their virtue, walked with kings and not lost the common touch. Sometimes it does take a degree of specialized knowledge to deal with language that is referred to as terms of art, meaning, in a legal context these words take on a different meaning. They have a precision. They have a history. But even when you're using words such as those, they should be constructed in the form of sentences which are well put together so that a person reading the sentence will understand what is being stated. Many of the sentences that exist in the statutes are far too long. One of the things that I was doing when I wrote a tongue-in-cheek amendment for Senator "Annie Oakley's" gun bill was to show in addition a bit of satire that I could construct the longest sentence in the statute books. It's one long sentence, and I don't think anybody noticed that, but it was to show how statutes often are written. They become so convoluted they turn back upon themselves. You cannot always tell what is being modified by language that you read. At the end of a sentence you don't know whether it's going to refer back to what preceded, or if it's designed to introduce to you...introduce you to that which follows, and that becomes difficult when legal challenges are launched. I know that when statutes are drafted there's a disinclination to use punctuation marks. Punctuation marks serve a purpose. They are designed to help convey to the reader the sense of what those words are to project. So if you took one long statement and did not punctuate it anywhere, there