

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

April 3, 1997            LB 114A, 114, 125A, 269, 280, 590, 660, 806

SENATOR COORDSEN: The Chambers amendment is adopted. Is there anything further on the bill? The call is raised. Mr. Clerk, do you have items for the record?

CLERK: I do, Mr. President. Communication from the Speaker regarding designation of major proposals. (Re: LB 806, LB 269, LB 590, LB 660.) A new A bill by Senator Brown. (Read LB 125A by title for the first time.) And a communication from the Governor. (Read. Re: LB 114A and LB 114.) (See pages 1330-32 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, the next amendment I have to the bill is by Senator Chambers, Floor Amendment 123, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I'm moving right down the bill, and the bill consists of the E & R amendment, AM7098, and it's in the bill book, if you're interested in looking at what it is I'm doing, and would like to insert the language that is added and strike whatever is stricken. This amendment takes us to line 12. There's only one page to the committee amend... I mean the E & R amendments, so I'll just mention the line. Line 12, would strike the words "would be" and replace them with the word "are", a-r-e. This is what I'm dealing with, we're amending in this portion of the bill, Section 42-117, and we're talking about recognition of marriages from other locations. Before we get into the philosophy, the policy questions, or whatever it is that leads a person to have the opinion he or she has about marriage and recognition or nonrecognition, I'm dealing only with what I call technical, drafting, or clarifying amendments. This one, though, I feel is of substance in view of what it is we're doing with this bill; 42-117, as amended, reads thusly: All marriages contracted in any other country, state, or territory, which would be valid by the laws of that country, state, or territory, and so forth. Since we're talking about recognizing or not recognizing various types of marriage, the words "would be" are vague. Either the marriages are or they are not valid, and what I want us to say with precision is that even though legislation of this kind can result in litigation, that litigation should be narrowly drawn and it should be possible to draw it narrowly because we are using precise language. The more precise the language we use, the fewer