

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

February 19, 1997 LR 13

constitutional language, that would have had a specific understandable meaning with relationship to the United States being attacked. But why do we keep these words, "enemy attack", with reference to the state of Nebraska?

SENATOR WARNER: Well, Senator, if there's a drafting issue here, I'm not going to...it needs to be adjusted, that's something that certainly I would agree that we would look at. As I indicated, you know, though, that the commission started out exactly where you...were commenting in your previous remarks, and that is that the whole thing ought to come out. That was the discussion, and as the discussion went along, rather than taking it completely out it was to limit it...or to expand it, actually, to include what, perhaps, would be more likely to occur today. Over...well, it's your time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That's all right, because I can put my light on again. Because I want to ask you if I would offer to strike the words "enemy attack", could you support an amendment like that?

SENATOR WARNER: I would like to have the opportunity to be...to look...it may well be that I could, but I'd like to look...I'd like to look at the whole thing in total because I don't know off the top of my head.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. And Mr. Speaker, I hope that the question won't be voted on or called before I offer that amendment because I do intend to offer it, and I will write it up or I'll sign a sheet, and then the clerk could write in "on page 1, line 10, strike the words 'enemy attack'". And that's an amendment I'm going to offer. I'll come right up and sign it.

SPEAKER WITHEM: The Chair would recognize Senator Warner to...Senator Warner's light is on next, if you care to speak.

SENATOR WARNER: Yeah, Mr. President. I was trying to read this...probably, just reading this quickly that if "enemy attack to part of the United States" perhaps...perhaps that should have stayed in there for clarification purposes as Senator Chambers points out, and he'd have to make the same change on the next