

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

April 1, 1997

LB 422

be noticed as something that's out of step. So I believe that in view of what this bill is purportedly attempting to do that my amendment, which constitutes a statement of position by the Legislature, is germane, in fact I think intent language is germane to any bill. Any time a bill covers a subject and intent language is offered which embraces that subject, that intent language is germane. I am not striking anything from LB 422. I am not adding anything to the operative language of 422. I am offering intent language. Intent language is always separate from the operative language of a bill. And I believe that the Chair, anybody who would sit in the chair would be hard pressed to show that intent language flows logically, to use that one sentence, and construe it as narrowly as it's being construed here, flows logically from any one point of the bill. And that's why I'm going to be challenging the germaneness of amendments from now on, even though I want a broad construction. And if there is a narrow enough construction on all of these amendments, then others will push for a broader construction. But if to circumvent what I'm doing they have to give a broad construction because there's an amendment they want to have added, then that's fuel for my fire, because I can show where it was broadly construed. So in either case I won't lose. I think this was an unwise challenge, not mine, but of the germaneness of this amendment. And I think the Chair made a mistake in ruling that intent language which goes directly to the subject and purpose of the bill is not germane. I pointed out that those who support 422, even one of the cosponsors, talked about the deterrent value, prevention, a preventative. This intent language expresses how the Legislature thinks that that preventative can occur and what the Legislature would like to see. And that's all intent language is. If you're going to go beyond intent language, then you draft a bill. Everything in the bill is operative, it causes something to happen, and it carries legal consequences if it happens or if it doesn't happen. Intent language is not like that. It can be stricken from the bill and none of the operative language will be changed at all, everything remains exactly as it was. It's something like the wrapping that you put around a bowling ball. You can tell that what's in the wrapping paper is round because of the configuration of the paper which hugs it. So you untie the ribbon, remove the paper, there is the bowling ball. The paper is not a part of the bowling ball. The intent language is not a