

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

[LB47 LB131 LB190 LB270 LB275 LB276 LB285 LB327 LB471 LB474 LB474A LB505
LB505A LB735 LB785 LB811 LB814 LB846 LB880 LB886 LB897 LB907 LB909 LB915
LB921 LB929 LB947 LB952 LB1009 LB1072 LB1104 LR26CA LR35 LR416 LR417 LR422
LR424 LR425 LR426]

SPEAKER HADLEY PRESIDING

SPEAKER HADLEY: GOOD MORNING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. WELCOME TO THE GEORGE W. NORRIS LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER FOR THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTH LEGISLATURE, SECOND SESSION. OUR CHAPLAIN FOR TODAY IS REVEREND JERRY YOUNT FROM BARADA UNITED METHODIST CHURCH IN BARADA, NEBRASKA. PLEASE RISE.

REVEREND YOUNT: (PRAYER OFFERED.)

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, REVEREND YOUNT. I CALL TO ORDER THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTH LEGISLATURE, SECOND SESSION. SENATORS, PLEASE RECORD YOUR PRESENCE. ROLL CALL. MR. CLERK, PLEASE RECORD.

ASSISTANT CLERK: THERE IS A QUORUM PRESENT, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, MR. CLERK. ARE THERE ANY CORRECTIONS FOR THE JOURNAL?

ASSISTANT CLERK: NO CORRECTIONS THIS MORNING.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU. ARE THERE ANY MESSAGES, REPORTS, OR ANNOUNCEMENTS?

ASSISTANT CLERK: THERE ARE, MR. PRESIDENT. YOUR COMMITTEE ON ENROLLMENT AND REVIEW REPORTS LB285 AS CORRECTLY ENGROSSED. I HAVE A REPORT OF REGISTERED LOBBYISTS FOR THE CURRENT WEEK, AS WELL AS AN ANNOUNCEMENT THAT AGENCY REPORTS FILED ELECTRONICALLY ARE AVAILABLE THROUGH THE WEB SITE. A NEW RESOLUTION: LR424 BY SENATOR KOLOWSKI; THAT WILL BE LAID OVER. AND THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE GIVES NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING FEBRUARY 4. THAT'S ALL I HAVE THIS MORNING. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGES 441-443.) [LB285 LR424]

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, MR. CLERK. WHILE THE LEGISLATURE IS IN SESSION AND CAPABLE OF TRANSACTING BUSINESS, I PROPOSE TO SIGN AND DO HEREBY SIGN LR416 AND LR417. MR. CLERK. [LR416 LR417]

ASSISTANT CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, THE FIRST ITEM OF BUSINESS THIS MORNING IS A REPORT ON GUBERNATORIAL APPOINTMENT FROM NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGE 415.)

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR SCHILZ, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO REPORT AS CHAIR OF THE NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE ON YOUR CONFIRMATIONS.

SENATOR SCHILZ: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. MEMBERS OF THE BODY, GOOD MORNING. TODAY I BRING BEFORE YOU THE CONFIRMATION OF MR. GORDON JEFF FASSETT OR GORDON...LET ME MAKE SURE I'VE GOT THIS CORRECT. GORDON W. JEFF FASSETT, AND HE GOES BY JEFF. BUT WE HAD HIS HEARING ON JANUARY 22. HE WAS APPOINTED BY THE GOVERNOR IN AUGUST 2015. HE HAS SERVED IN MANY CAPACITIES IN THE WATER WORLD, SO TO SPEAK, INCLUDING EXPERIENCE WITH THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN, THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN, THE NORTH PLATTE RIVER BASIN, AND THE COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN, AS WELL AS GREAT BASIN BEAR RIVER ISSUES THAT ARE GOING ON...THAT WERE GOING ON. AND SO HE HAS A PLETHORA OF EXPERIENCE AND KNOWLEDGE AS IT COMES TO WATER AND WATER ADMINISTRATION. HIS HEARING WAS VERY THOROUGH. HE TALKED TO US FOR ABOUT 30 MINUTES ABOUT HIS QUALIFICATIONS, WHAT HE DID. IT WAS A VERY GOOD HEARING, VERY GOOD TO HEAR HIM, AND I AM EXCITED TO BRING THIS NOMINATION TO YOU. AND WITH THAT, I WOULD ASK YOU FOR HIS CONFIRMATION. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

SPEAKER HADLEY: YOU'VE HEARD THE OPENING ON THE CONFIRMATION. IS THERE ANYONE WISHING TO SPEAK? SEEING NONE, SENATOR SCHILZ. SENATOR SCHILZ WAIVES CLOSING. THE QUESTION IS THE APPROVAL OF THE CONFIRMATION REPORT. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY VOTING AYE; ALL OPPOSED VOTE NAY. HAVE ALL VOTED THAT WISH? RECORD, MR. CLERK.

ASSISTANT CLERK: (RECORD VOTE, LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGES 443-444.) 28 AYES, 0 NAYS ON THE ADOPTION OF THE REPORT, MR. PRESIDENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: THE CONFIRMATION REPORT IS APPROVED. MR. CLERK FOR THE FIRST ITEM ON GENERAL FILE.

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

ASSISTANT CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, THE FIRST BILL THIS MORNING, LB505, WHICH WAS INTRODUCED BY SENATOR KRIST. (READ TITLE.) THE BILL WAS READ FOR THE FIRST TIME ON JANUARY 21 OF THIS YEAR. IT WAS REFERRED TO THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE. THAT COMMITTEE REPORTS THE BILL TO GENERAL FILE WITH COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS ATTACHED. (AM391, LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGE 568, FIRST SESSION, 2015.) [LB505]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR KRIST, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON LB505. [LB505]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. GOOD MORNING, COLLEAGUES, AND GOOD MORNING, NEBRASKA. LB505 ADVANCED FROM JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ON AN 8-0 VOTE. I WANT TO THANK CHAIRMAN SEILER AND MY FELLOW MEMBERS OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE FOR ADVANCING THIS BILL. LB505 IS DESIGNED TO STRENGTHEN THE PRIVACY PROVISIONS OF NEBRASKA REVISED STATUTE SECTION 29-3523 THAT REMOVES ARRESTS NOT LEADING, NOT LEADING, NOT LEADING TO A CONVICTION FROM PUBLIC RECORD. THE PURPOSE OF THE BILL IS TO PROTECT LEGALLY INNOCENT NEBRASKANS FROM THE STIGMA OF PERMANENT PUBLIC CRIMINAL RECORDS. IN 2007 NEBRASKA REVISED STATUTE SECTION 29-3523 WAS AMENDED TO REMOVE AN ARREST FROM THE PUBLIC RECORD WHEN THE RELATED CRIMINAL CHARGES ARE DISMISSED. THE INTENT OF THIS BILL WAS FRUSTRATED BY PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE RECORD OF SUCH CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS THROUGH COURT FILINGS AND THE NEBRASKA TRIAL COURT'S MANAGEMENT SYSTEM, OR JUSTICE AS IT IS COINED. THE BILL CLOSES THE LOOPHOLE BY MANDATING THAT THE STATE COURTS SEAL THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR SUCH CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS. IN ADDITION, THIS BILL EXPANDS THE CATEGORY OF ARRESTS ELIGIBLE FOR PRIVACY PROTECTION IN NEBRASKA IN SECTION 29-3523 TO INCLUDE INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE ACQUITTED OF CRIMINAL CHARGES AND OFFENDERS WHO SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETE DRUG COURT AND OTHER PROBLEM-SOLVING COURTS, EXTENDING TO THEM PRIVACY PROTECTIONS NOW AFFORDED TO OFFENDERS WHO COMPLETE DIVERSION BEFORE CRIMINAL CHARGES ARE FILED. OUR EMPHASIS THIS YEAR...AND SEVERAL SENATORS ARE BRINGING FORWARD PROBLEM-SOLVING COURTS. IF THOSE PROBLEM-SOLVING COURTS ARE GOING TO WORK, THEN WE NEED TO REMOVE THIS STIGMA AT THE END OF THE PROCEEDINGS. FINALLY, THE BILL CLARIFIES THAT WHEN AN ARREST IS REMOVED FROM THE PUBLIC RECORD A PERSON IS NOT REQUIRED TO DISCLOSE THE ARREST IN RESPONSE TO PUBLIC INQUIRY. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, AND I ASK YOU FOR A GREEN VOTE ULTIMATELY ON LB505. [LB505]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SPEAKER HADLEY: AS THE CLERK STATED, THERE ARE AMENDMENTS FROM THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE. SENATOR SEILER, AS CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON THE AMENDMENTS. [LB505]

SENATOR SEILER: MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE UNICAMERAL, AN INTERESTING VOTE. WOULD YOU LISTEN UP SO YOU DON'T VOTE WRONG? WE'RE ASKING YOU TO VOTE NO ON THE AMENDMENTS BECAUSE SENATOR KRIST IS ALREADY INTRODUCING AN AMENDMENT THAT COVERS THE AMENDMENTS OF THE COMMITTEE, AND THERE'S NO USE VOTING TWICE ON THEM, SO I'M ASKING YOU TO VOTE NO ON THE AMENDMENTS, YES ON THE...VOTE NO ON THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS; VOTE YES ON SENATOR KRIST'S AMENDMENTS WHICH COVER THE SAME THING. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. [LB505]

SPEAKER HADLEY: IS THERE ANYONE WISHING TO SPEAK ON THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS? SEEING NONE, SENATOR SEILER, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE. SENATOR SEILER WAIVES CLOSING. THE QUESTION IS THE ADOPTION OF THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS. ALL IN FAVOR VOTE AYE; OPPOSED VOTE NAY. HAVE ALL VOTED THAT WISH? RECORD, MR. CLERK. [LB505]

ASSISTANT CLERK: 0 AYES, 25 NAYS ON THE ADOPTION OF COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS, MR. PRESIDENT. [LB505]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT IS NOT ADOPTED. [LB505]

ASSISTANT CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, SENATOR KRIST WOULD OFFER AM1931. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGES 444-446.) [LB505]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR KRIST, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON AM1931. [LB505]

SENATOR KRIST: SENATOR SCHILZ JUST TOLD ME THAT HE WAS CONFUSED, AND I HOPE TO UNCONFUSE THE SITUATION. AM1931 REPLACES THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT. IT SIMPLY REMOVES...THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT CHANGED THE PENALTY FROM A MISDEMEANOR TO AN INFRACTION. THE AMENDMENT WOULD ELIMINATE THE PENALTY. WE NEED TO ELIMINATE THE PENALTY BECAUSE THAT PENALTY IS ALREADY IN SECTION 29-3527. SO IT ALREADY EXISTS IN LAW. VOTE YES FOR AM1931 AND IT REPLACES LB505, AND A GREEN VOTE ON LB505, PLEASE. [LB505]

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR KRIST. IS THERE ANYONE WISHING TO SPEAK ON AM1931? SEEING NONE, SENATOR KRIST, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. SENATOR KRIST WAIVES CLOSING ON AM1931. THE QUESTION FOR THE BODY IS THE ADOPTION OF AM1931. ALL IN FAVOR VOTE AYE; ALL OPPOSED VOTE NAY. RECORD, MR. CLERK. [LB505]

ASSISTANT CLERK: 32 AYES, 0 NAYS ON THE ADOPTION OF SENATOR KRIST'S AMENDMENT. [LB505]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THE AMENDMENT IS ADOPTED. IS THERE ANYONE WISHING TO SPEAK ON LB505 AS AMENDED? SENATOR KRIST, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE. SENATOR KRIST WAIVES CLOSING. THE VOTE FOR THE BODY IS THE ADVANCEMENT TO E&R INITIAL ON LB505. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY VOTING AYE; OPPOSED VOTE NAY. HAVE ALL VOTED THAT WISH? RECORD, MR. CLERK. [LB505]

ASSISTANT CLERK: 35 AYES, 0 NAYS ON THE MOTION TO ADVANCE THE BILL, MR. PRESIDENT. [LB505]

SPEAKER HADLEY: LB505 ADVANCES TO E&R INITIAL. (DOCTOR OF THE DAY INTRODUCED.) MR. CLERK, NEXT ITEM. [LB505]

ASSISTANT CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, LB505A INTRODUCED BY SENATOR KRIST. (TITLE READ.) [LB505A]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR KRIST, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON LB505A. [LB505A]

SENATOR KRIST: ONCE AGAIN, THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. GOOD MORNING, COLLEAGUES AND NEBRASKA. THE A BILL APPROPRIATES \$54,000 FROM THE SUPREME COURT AUTOMATION CASH FUND FOR 2017. THE SUPREME COURT STATES THE ADDITIONAL PROGRAMMING OF ELECTRONIC CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM WILL BE REQUIRED AS AN ESTIMATED ONE-TIME COST. SO JUST TO REMIND YOU, THIS IS A CASH FUND EXPENDITURE. IT DOES NOT COME OFF THE BOTTOM LINE FOR GENERAL FUNDS, AND IT'S \$54,000. PLEASE VOTE GREEN ON LB505A. [LB505A]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SPEAKER HADLEY: YOU'VE HEARD THE OPENING ON LB505A. IS THERE ANYONE WISHING TO SPEAK? SEEING NONE, SENATOR KRIST. SENATOR KRIST WAIVES CLOSING. THE QUESTION BEFORE THE BODY IS THE ADVANCEMENT OF LB505A. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY VOTING AYE; OPPOSED VOTE NAY. RECORD, MR. CLERK. [LB505A]

ASSISTANT CLERK: 30 AYES, 0 NAYS ON THE MOTION TO ADVANCE THE BILL, MR. PRESIDENT. [LB505A]

SPEAKER HADLEY: LB505A ADVANCES TO E&R INITIAL. MR. CLERK. [LB505A]

ASSISTANT CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, THE NEXT BILL IS LB275 INTRODUCED BY SENATOR FRIESEN. (TITLE READ.) THE BILL WAS READ FOR THE FIRST TIME ON JANUARY 14 OF THIS YEAR, REFERRED TO THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE. THAT COMMITTEE PLACED THE BILL ON GENERAL FILE WITH NO COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS. [LB275]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR FRIESEN, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON LB275. [LB275]

SENATOR FRIESEN: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER. GOOD MORNING. LB275 CLARIFIES EXISTING STATUTORY LANGUAGE. SOMETIMES THERE ARE LOOPHOLES OR UNINTENDED AMBIGUITIES IN OUR LAWS THAT NEED TO BE CORRECTED. LB275 IS JUST THAT. IF YOUR LICENSE IS REVOKED UNDER ANY OF THE PROVIDED STATUTES BEGINNING WITH 28-306, MOTOR VEHICLE HOMICIDE, ETCETERA, FOR A PERIOD OF 1 TO 15 YEARS AND THEN YOU DO DRIVE DESPITE THAT REVOCATION, THE STATUTE WOULD APPLY. SOMETIMES PEOPLE CHOOSE TO DRIVE ANYHOW AND THEN THEY ARE OBVIOUSLY ELIGIBLE FOR BEING CHARGED UNDER STATUTE AS A CLASS IV FELONY. AND ALONG WITH THAT COMES ANOTHER 15-YEAR REVOCATION. SOME PEOPLE CONTINUE TO DRIVE DESPITE THAT 15-YEAR REVOCATION AND THEN THEY'RE ELIGIBLE FOR ENHANCEMENTS UNDER 28-306, AT LEAST IT WAS THOUGHT TO BE THE INTENT OF THE LEGISLATURE WHEN THIS LAW WAS PASSED. IN MERRICK COUNTY, THERE WAS AN INDIVIDUAL CONVICTED OF DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE, THIRD OFFENSE IN 1995. HIS LICENSE WAS REVOKED FOR 15 YEARS. HE WAS INELIGIBLE TO BE REINSTATED IN OCTOBER 2010. HE CHOSE TO DRIVE ANYWAY. HE WAS STOPPED MAY 14 OF 2010 AND CONVICTED OF DRIVING UNDER THE 15-YEAR REVOCATION UNDER THE STATUTE. THIS PARTICULAR DRIVER DID NOT DO THIS JUST ONE TIME BUT FOUR SEPARATE TIMES. HE WAS CONVICTED UNDER

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

THE STATUTE DRIVING UNDER REVOCATION IN 2001 IN DODGE COUNTY, AGAIN IN 2003 IN BUTLER COUNTY AND ALSO CONVICTED FOR DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE. CONVICTED AGAIN IN 2004 IN DODGE COUNTY NOT ONLY FOR DRIVING DURING REVOCATION BUT FOR DUI AGAIN AND THEN IN PLATTE COUNTY IN 2010. THIS DEFENDANT WAS THEN ARRESTED AND HE POSTED BOND AND HE GOT OUT OF JAIL ON WHAT WOULD BE HIS FIFTH OFFENSE DRIVING DURING THIS REVOCATION. BUT THEN HE WAS ARRESTED THREE MONTHS LATER IN HALL COUNTY FOR THE VERY SAME THING. SO ESSENTIALLY THIS DRIVER WAS ELIGIBLE TO BE REINSTATED ON THAT UNDERLYING CHARGE BUT NOT ON THE 15-YEAR REVOCATION. SO IF YOU LOOK AT THE LAW AS THE WAY IT WAS WRITTEN UNDER THIS SECTION, IF YOU STRICTLY CONSTRUE THAT LITERAL INTERPRETATION IT WOULD MEAN THAT YOU STILL HAVE TO BE SUSPENDED FOR ONE OF THE UNDERLYING OFFENSES. AND SO IN THAT PARTICULAR SITUATION HE'S NOT SUSPENDED ANY LONGER FOR ONE OF THOSE OFFENSES. AS A RESULT THEY HAD TO CHARGE HIM FOR DRIVING DURING SUSPENSION UNDER 60-4,108 WHICH IS SIMPLY A CLASS II MISDEMEANOR, A COMPLICATED LOOPHOLE TO EXPLAIN BUT AN EASY PROBLEM TO FIX. LB275 IS A CLARIFYING BILL THAT DOES NOT INCREASE PENALTIES BEYOND WHAT THEY CURRENTLY ARE. I HOPE THERE'S SOME OTHER ATTORNEYS IN THE ROOM THAT COULD EXPLAIN THE LEGAL TECHNICALITIES OF THIS BILL, AND SO I HOPE YOU WOULD VOTE TO ADVANCE LB275. [LB275]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR FRIESEN. YOU'VE HEARD THE OPENING ON LB275. IS THERE ANYONE WISHING TO SPEAK? SEEING NONE, SENATOR FRIESEN, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE ON YOUR BILL. SENATOR FRIESEN WAIVES CLOSING. THE QUESTION BEFORE THE BODY IS THE ADVANCEMENT OF LB275 TO E&R INITIAL. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY VOTING AYE; OPPOSED VOTE NAY. HAVE ALL VOTED THAT WISH? RECORD, MR. CLERK. [LB275]

ASSISTANT CLERK: 32 AYES, 1 NAY ON THE MOTION TO ADVANCE THE BILL, MR. PRESIDENT. [LB275]

SPEAKER HADLEY: LB275 ADVANCES TO E&R INITIAL. MR. CLERK. [LB275]

ASSISTANT CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, THE NEXT BILL IS LB474 INTRODUCED BY SENATOR CHAMBERS. (TITLE READ.) THE BILL WAS READ FOR THE FIRST TIME ON JANUARY 20 OF THIS YEAR, REFERRED TO THE TRANSPORTATION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE. THAT COMMITTEE PLACED THE BILL ON

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

GENERAL FILE WITH COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS. (AM347, LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGE 596, FIRST SESSION, 2015.) [LB474]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON LB474. [LB474]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, THIS IS A BILL THAT I HAVE TO UPDATE MYSELF ON WHEN IT COMES TO THE SPECIFICS. BUT WHAT IT WAS DESIGNED TO DO ORIGINALLY WAS TO ISSUE WHAT'S CALLED A MOUNTAIN LION PROTECTION PLATE. THE COMMITTEE DECIDED THAT IT SHOULD BE A DIFFERENT TERM--INSTEAD OF "PROTECTION" PUT "CONSERVATION." THAT IS WHAT I'M INTERESTED IN ANYWAY, SO IN THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT THAT IS WHAT WOULD BE DONE. THAT WORD "PROTECTION" EVERYWHERE IN THE BILL WOULD BE CHANGED TO "CONSERVATION." AND BECAUSE SUCH A GOOD SUMMARY WAS PROVIDED BY THE COMMITTEE, I'M JUST GOING TO DO WHAT I ORDINARILY DON'T HAVE TO DO, IS READ THAT SUMMARY. THE LEGISLATION WOULD ESTABLISH A NEW CATEGORY OF VEHICLE LICENSE PLATE: MOUNTAIN LION CONSERVATION PLATES. THE DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES IS TO DESIGN THE PLATE AND SUCH DESIGN SHALL REFLECT SUPPORT FOR PROTECTION OF THE MOUNTAIN LION. THE PLATE SHALL CONSIST OF TWO TYPES: 1) ALPHANUMERIC WITH UP TO FIVE CHARACTERS AND NO COUNTY DESIGNATION; AND 2) PERSONALIZED MESSAGES WITH UP TO FIVE CHARACTERS ALLOWED. AND THE PRICE FOR THESE PLATES WILL BE THE SAME AS ANY OTHER SPECIALTY PLATE. BUT DOWN HERE IN THE COMMITTEE STATEMENT IT SAYS: AN ALPHANUMERIC PLATE SHALL INCLUDE PAYMENT OF A \$5 FEE. THE FEE IS DIRECTED TO THE GAME AND PARKS COMMISSION EDUCATIONAL FUND; AND ISSUANCE OF THE PERSONALIZED MESSAGE PLATE SHALL INCLUDE PAYMENT OF A \$10 (SIC--\$40) FEE. THAT FEE IS TO BE DISTRIBUTED AS FOLLOWS: \$10 TO THE DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES CASH FUND, AND \$30 TO THE GAME AND PARKS COMMISSION EDUCATIONAL FUND. I'VE BEEN TOLD BY ANY NUMBER OF PEOPLE THAT THEY WOULD PURCHASE THESE PLATES. THERE IS A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF SUPPORT FOR CONSERVING THE SMALL POPULATION OF MOUNTAIN LIONS WHICH WE HAVE IN THIS STATE. THE DEPARTMENT HAS INDICATED THAT THERE WILL BE NO HUNTING SEASON DUE TO THE NUMBER OF LIONS THAT HAVE BEEN KILLED BY AUTOMOBILE; ILLEGAL SHOOTING; ACCIDENTAL, AS IT'S CALLED, TRAPPING. AND AMONG THOSE KILLED WERE FEMALES AND WITHOUT FEMALES THERE IS NO WAY TO CREATE A VIABLE POPULATION. NEBRASKA HAS SUCH A SMALL POPULATION OF THESE ANIMALS NOT ONLY BECAUSE OF THE ATTEMPT TO EXTERMINATE THEM, BUT IT'S A PASS-THROUGH STATE. MANY

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

ANIMALS, WELL SOME, WILL PASS THROUGH NEBRASKA ON THE WAY TO SOMEWHERE ELSE. AND BECAUSE DNA TECHNOLOGY IS USED TO TRACK THE MOVEMENT OF THESE ANIMALS, SOME HAVE BEEN FOUND TO HAVE WALKED MORE THAN 1,200 MILES TO SOMEPLACE OUT EAST WHERE IT DID ESTABLISH LIVING SPACE. AND THE REASON THIS COULD BE DONE, THE ANIMAL WOULD BE KILLED. AND WHEN THEY WERE EXAMINING THE DNA--I GUESS THEY MIGHT HAVE SOME NATIONAL SYSTEM LIKE IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM--THEY COULD TRACE THE DNA OF THAT ANIMAL BACK TO NEBRASKA AND TO OTHER STATES EVEN FARTHER WEST. SO YOU HAVE A SMALL POPULATION, AND WHAT'S BEING DONE IN NEBRASKA BY MY ATTEMPTS, AND MANY PEOPLE AGREE WITH IT TO DO AWAY WITH THE HUNTING SEASON, IS NOW NOT ONLY KNOWN NATIONALLY, BUT INTERNATIONALLY. I RECEIVE CARDS, LETTERS OF SUPPORT FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE CONCERNED ABOUT THE EXTERMINATION OF ANY SPECIES. AND EVEN IF THE EXTERMINATION IS NOT THROUGHOUT A COUNTRY BUT IN A GIVEN AREA WHERE THAT ANIMAL WOULD LIVE, THEY WANT TO KNOW IF THERE'S ANYTHING THEY CAN DO. SO THIS IS NOT AN ISOLATED ISSUE. GAME AND PARKS HAS SUGGESTED THEY CANNOT WITH GREAT CERTITUDE SPECIFY EXACTLY OR WITHIN A REASONABLE DEGREE OF ACCURACY HOW MANY ANIMALS THERE ARE IN NEBRASKA NOW. BUT THIS BILL HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH ABOLISHING THE HUNTING SEASON. AND I SAY AGAIN, THERE ARE PEOPLE WHO WOULD PURCHASE THESE PLATES, AND WHATEVER THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF POTENTIAL PURCHASES WOULD BE BEFORE A PLATE IS ISSUED I'M SURE THAT WOULD BE ACHIEVED. AND I WOULD BE AMONG THOSE WHO WOULD PURCHASE SUCH A PLATE. SO IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, I WILL ANSWER THEM. BUT BEFORE THAT, LET ME READ YOU LANGUAGE FROM THE BILL WHICH TALKS ABOUT THIS FUND. AND THIS IS ON PAGE 2 OF THE GREEN COPY BEGINNING IN LINE 5. "THE GAME AND PARKS COMMISSION EDUCATIONAL FUND IS CREATED. THE FUND SHALL CONSIST OF MONEY CREDITED PURSUANT TO SECTION 10 OF THIS ACT"--AND I TOUCHED ON THOSE FUNDS--"AND ANY OTHER MONEY AS DETERMINED BY THE LEGISLATURE. THE COMMISSION SHALL USE THE FUND TO PROVIDE YOUTH EDUCATION PROGRAMS RELATING TO WILDLIFE CONSERVATION PRACTICES. ANY MONEY IN THE FUND AVAILABLE FOR INVESTMENT SHALL BE INVESTED BY THE STATE INVESTMENT OFFICER PURSUANT TO THE NEBRASKA CAPITAL EXPANSION ACT AND THE NEBRASKA STATE FUNDS INVESTMENT ACT." BUT THIS MONEY PRIMARILY WOULD BE DESIGNED TO EDUCATE THE YOUTH IN CONSERVATION PRACTICES. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS THAT I'M ABLE TO ANSWER, I WILL. AND IF I DON'T HAVE THE ANSWER OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD, I WILL LOOK IN THE BILL AND LOCATE IT FOR YOU. BUT I'M ASKING THAT YOU ADVANCE THIS BILL. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LB474]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR CHAMBERS. AS THE CLERK STATED, THERE ARE AMENDMENTS FROM THE TRANSPORTATION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE. SENATOR SMITH, AS CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON THE AMENDMENTS. [LB474]

SENATOR SMITH: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, AND GOOD MORNING, COLLEAGUES. SENATOR CHAMBERS HAS ALREADY ADDRESSED REALLY WHAT IS INCLUDED IN THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT. THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT CHANGES THE PLATE NAME TO THE MOUNTAIN LION CONSERVATION LICENSE PLATE AS OPPOSED TO PROTECTION. WE CHANGE THAT ONE WORD, "PROTECTION" TO "CONSERVATION." AS AMENDED, THE BILL ADVANCED FROM COMMITTEE WITH 7 IN SUPPORT AND 1 IN OPPOSITION. MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, I ASK THAT YOU SUPPORT THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT, AM347, TO THE UNDERLYING BILL LB474. THANK YOU, COLLEAGUES. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LB474]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR SMITH. YOU'VE HEARD THE OPENING TO AM347, THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT. SENATOR SCHNOOR, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LB474]

SENATOR SCHNOOR: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER. SENATOR CHAMBERS, WILL YOU YIELD TO A QUESTION, PLEASE? [LB474]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR CHAMBERS, WILL YOU YIELD? [LB474]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: YES, I WILL. [LB474]

SENATOR SCHNOOR: I COULD HAVE SWORE I HEARD YOU SAY THAT YOU WANT MONEY TO GO TO GAME AND PARKS. IS THAT CORRECT? [LB474]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: FOR A SPECIFIC FUND FOR THE CHILDREN, AND THE ONLY REASON I DO THAT, BECAUSE THIS PLATE WILL GENERATE SOME MONEY, AND THIS EARMARKS WHERE IT WOULD GO. SO IN A SENSE IT WILL GO TO GAME AND PARKS FOR THEIR HANDLING. [LB474]

SENATOR SCHNOOR: WELL, IN A SENSE, BUT IN REALITY IT'S GOING TO GAME AND PARKS AS YOU SAID, CORRECT? [LB474]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SENATOR CHAMBERS: YES, BUT NOT FOR GAME AND PARKS ITSELF. [LB474]

SENATOR SCHNOOR: OKAY, SO IT'S NOT FOR GAME AND PARKS TO HELP IN THEIR CONSERVATION PROCESS AS WELL? [LB474]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: IF TEACHING CHILDREN ABOUT GAME AND PARKS PRACTICES AS A COLLATERAL BENEFIT DOES SOMETHING THAT GAME AND PARKS IS DOING, THAT'S THE PRICE THAT IS PAID WHEN YOU BRING LEGISLATION. [LB474]

SENATOR SCHNOOR: OKAY. THAT'S ALL. I JUST WANTED TO CLARIFY THAT YOU, IN FACT, SAID YOU WANT THIS MONEY TO GO TO GAME AND PARKS. SO I JUST WANTED TO MAKE SURE THAT IS ON THE RECORD AND EVERYBODY HEARD THAT. SO THAT'S ALL I HAVE. THANK YOU, SIR. [LB474]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR SCHNOOR AND SENATOR CHAMBERS. SENATOR KRIST, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED. [LB474]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, AND GOOD MORNING, COLLEAGUES AND NEBRASKA, AGAIN. I WONDERED IF SENATOR CHAMBERS WOULD YIELD TO A COUPLE QUESTIONS. [LB474]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR CHAMBERS, WILL YOU YIELD? [LB474]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: YES, I WILL. [LB474]

SENATOR KRIST: SENATOR CHAMBERS, WHEN I CAME IN IN 2009, YOU WERE ON YOUR WAY OUT AND SAT YOUR FOUR YEARS. AND WHEN I GOT HERE, THE MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE THAT WERE HERE SAID, IF YOU WANT TO DO CUSTOM LICENSE PLATES, PERSONAL LICENSE PLATES GET IT DONE NOW BECAUSE ERNIE DOESN'T LIKE THOSE. WHAT CHANGED? [LB474]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SENATOR, IF THERE HAD NOT BEEN A PROLIFERATION OF DIFFERENT SLOGANS AND GROUPS ON THE LICENSE PLATES, I WOULD NOT HAVE ALTERED MY POSITION. I ALTERED IT BEFORE THIS BILL CAME UP BECAUSE I POINTED OUT THAT I HAD LOST THE BATTLE OF KEEPING THE LICENSE PLATES FREE OF ANYTHING OTHER THAN THE IDENTIFYING NUMBERS OR INSIGNIA. SINCE THAT BATTLE WAS LOST, ANYTHING THAT SOMEBODY COULD GET ON THE

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

PLATE--AND BY THAT I MEANT WITHIN REASON OR THAT I DIDN'T HAVE A PERSONAL OBJECTION TO--I WOULD NOT FIGHT THAT BATTLE ANYMORE BECAUSE IT HAD ALREADY BEEN LOST. [LB474]

SENATOR KRIST: SO IF I COULD JUST SUMMARIZE, YOU SAW THE LIGHT. [LB474]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: RELUCTANTLY, BUT, YES. [LB474]

SENATOR KRIST: OKAY. THANK YOU. I WOULD HOPE THAT YOU WOULD ASK FOR "COUGAR 1" ON YOUR PLATE. THANK YOU. [LB474]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR KRIST. SENATOR CAMPBELL, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LB474]

SENATOR CAMPBELL: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. YOU KNOW, I BELIEVE THAT SENATOR CHAMBERS GOES HOME AT NIGHT AND HAS GREAT CONSTERNATION ABOUT WHETHER WE EVER LISTEN TO HIM AND HIS STORIES. BUT I WANT SENATOR CHAMBERS TO KNOW THAT THIS PAST SUNDAY NIGHT I WAS WATCHING 60 MINUTES. AND ON 60 MINUTES THEY SAID, AND NOW WE'LL HAVE A REPORT ON MOUNTAIN LIONS. AND I ACTUALLY EXPECTED TO SEE SENATOR CHAMBERS INTERVIEWED. UNFORTUNATELY, THEY DON'T KNOW ABOUT OUR ADVOCATE HERE. BUT IT WAS A MOST INTERESTING SEGMENT, AND I TELL IT BECAUSE I WANTED SENATOR CHAMBERS TO HEAR THIS STORY ALSO. IT WAS ON MOUNTAIN LIONS IN LOS ANGELES. AND THEY GO TO A GREAT EFFORT THERE TO TAG THEM AND TO WATCH THEM AND TO TRY TO PROTECT THEM BECAUSE THERE'S SMALL AREAS IN THE MOUNTAINS WHERE THE MOUNTAIN LIONS ARE THERE. AND THEY COME DOWN AND THEY WALK THROUGH PEOPLE'S PATIOS. BUT TO DATE, THEY HAVE HARMED NO HUMAN. AND WHAT IS ALSO VERY INTERESTING ABOUT THIS IS THAT COUGARS TEND TO MAKE THEIR WAY ACROSS SIX- AND EIGHT-LANE INTERSTATES AROUND L.A. WITHOUT AN ACCIDENT OR BEING KILLED. BUT THEY'RE VERY WORRIED ABOUT THAT POPULATION, AND THEY ARE THINKING ABOUT BUILDING A BRIDGE THAT WOULD GO OVER THE INTERSTATE SO THAT THE MOUNTAIN LIONS COULD TRAVERSE THAT WITHOUT FEAR OF BEING HIT BY A CAR. BUT I WANTED SENATOR CHAMBERS TO KNOW THAT WE DO PAY ATTENTION TO WHAT HE SAYS, AND WE DO PERK UP WHEN IT'S ON THE NATIONAL NEWS. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LB474]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR CAMPBELL. SENATOR SMITH, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED. [LB474]

SENATOR SMITH: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. AND I'M GOING TO ASK SENATOR CHAMBERS TO TAKE US ON A WALK DOWN MEMORY LANE. IN MORE RECENT HISTORY, THE ORIGINS OF THIS BILL, I BELIEVE IT STARTED IN 2014 WITH A PROPOSED AMENDMENT BY NOW-AUDITOR CHARLIE JANSSEN, THEN-SENATOR CHARLIE JANSSEN. CAN YOU REFRESH OUR MEMORY, SENATOR CHAMBERS? [LB474]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: YES, AND I'LL DO IT WITHOUT ACRIMONY. I HAD A BILL TO ABOLISH THE HUNTING SEASON. THE LEGISLATURE PASSED IT. THE GOVERNOR VETOED IT. AND TWO SENATORS WHOSE NAMES I WILL NOT MENTION BECAUSE THAT'S NOT THE PURPOSE OF THIS, ONE HAD SAID IF THERE WERE 28 VOTES TO OVERRIDE HE WOULD BE THE 29TH. ANOTHER HAD GIVEN ME THE ASSURANCE THAT IF THERE WERE 29 VOTES HE'D BE THE 30TH. AS IT TURNED OUT BOTH OF THEM RENEGED. ONE OF THEM STOOD UP AND GAVE HIS MEA CULPA AND I TOLD HIM THAT WAS NOT NECESSARY. HE WAS NOT THE ONLY ONE WHO HAD BACKED OFF, SO ALL THAT HE WAS SAYING, I APPRECIATED, BUT IT WASN'T NECESSARY. WELL, SENATOR JANSSEN--I HAD OFFERED A RECONSIDERATION MOTION OR SOMETHING--HE WAS NOT FOR THE BILL, BUT HE VOTED FOR THAT TO GIVE ME A CHANCE TO MAKE MY PRESENTATION. SO HE CAME UP WITH THE IDEA THAT THERE COULD BE A MOUNTAIN LION PROTECTION PLATE. HE AND HIS STAFF DID ALL THE RESEARCH TO MAKE SURE THAT HIS AMENDMENT WOULD BE IN PERFECT SYNC WITH EVERY REQUIREMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES FOR THE ISSUANCE OF SUCH A PLATE. WHEN HE PRESENTED IT ON THE FLOOR, THERE WAS NOT OPPOSITION TO THE PLATE ITSELF, BUT BECAUSE THE BILL TO WHICH HE WANTED TO ATTACH IT HAD SOMETHING TO DO WITH VETERANS ONE WAY OR THE OTHER, AND SOME OF THE SENATORS THOUGHT IT WOULD TRIVIALIZE WHAT THEY WERE TRYING TO DO WITH REFERENCE TO THE VETERANS IF THEY ATTACHED THE MOUNTAIN LION PROTECTION PLATE, SO SOME WHO HAD NO OBJECTION TO THE PLATE WOULD NOT VOTE TO ATTACH IT TO THAT PARTICULAR BILL. SENATOR JANSSEN WITH MY AGREEMENT DECIDED IT WOULD BE BEST NOT TO MAKE AN ISSUE BECAUSE IT DIDN'T GO TO THE VALIDITY OF THE PLATE ITSELF BUT RATHER OBJECTION TO ATTACHING IT. SO HE WITHDREW THE PROPOSAL, AND THAT'S WHY NOTHING FURTHER WAS DONE ON IT THAT SESSION. [LB474]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR CHAMBERS. SENATOR GROENE, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED. [LB474]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SENATOR GROENE: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I'M NOT HERE TO POKE A STICK AT SENATOR CHAMBERS. WHAT I WANTED TO POINT OUT WAS THE REASON WE HAVE MOUNTAIN LIONS IN THIS STATE IS BECAUSE OF CONSERVATION. IT IS BECAUSE OF THE GAME AND PARKS COMMISSION. IT IS BECAUSE OF THE HUNTERS AND FISHERMEN IN THIS STATE THAT PAY THEIR FEES. WE HAVE A LOT OF GAME. MOUNTAIN LIONS CAME BACK TO THIS STATE BECAUSE OF THE EFFORTS OF THE PARKS DEPARTMENT, PARKS AND RECREATION (SIC) DEPARTMENT AND THEIR ELECTED OFFICIALS. THAT IS WHY MOUNTAIN LIONS SHOWED UP. THEY WERE BASICALLY EXTINCT. SO IF THIS BILL IS TO HONOR THE EFFORTS OF THE HUNTERS AND FISHERMEN OF THIS STATE WHO ENABLED MOUNTAIN LIONS TO COME BACK TO THIS STATE, I'M ALL FOR IT. I'M JUST WONDERING, I'M REAL PARTIAL TO RED FOXES. CAN WE GET ONE ON RED FOXES? I'M ALSO KIND OF PARTIAL TO BEAVERS BECAUSE I'VE GOT THEM IN THE STREAM NEAR ME. MUSKRATS, I LIKE MUSKRATS. THE POINT IS, WHERE DO WE STOP? AND THAT'S, I THINK, PROBABLY WHY SENATOR CHAMBERS IN THE PAST UNDERSTOOD THAT ABOUT THESE SPECIALIZED LICENSE PLATES. WHERE DO YOU STOP? WHAT CAUSE DO YOU FINALLY SAY NO TO? BUT, OH, I'M GOING TO SUPPORT THIS. I JUST WANTED TO POINT OUT WHY WE HAVE MOUNTAIN LIONS IN THIS STATE IS BECAUSE OF THE HUNTERS AND FISHERMEN IN THIS STATE WHO HAVE MADE SURE OUR WILD GAME AND OUR WILD ANIMALS PRESERVE AND ARE PRESENT FOR OUR NEXT GENERATIONS TO ENJOY. THANK YOU. [LB474]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR GROENE. IS THERE ANYONE ELSE WISHING TO SPEAK ON AM347? SEEING NONE, SENATOR SMITH, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE ON AM347. [LB474]

SENATOR SMITH: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. AND AGAIN, COLLEAGUES, I ENCOURAGE YOU TO PLEASE VOTE FOR THE TRANSPORTATION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMENDMENT TO LB474. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LB474]

SPEAKER HADLEY: YOU'VE HEARD THE CLOSING ON AM347. ALL IN FAVOR OF THE ADOPTION OF THE AMENDMENT VOTE AYE; OPPOSED VOTE NAY. HAVE ALL VOTED THAT WISH? RECORD, MR. CLERK. [LB474]

ASSISTANT CLERK: 36 AYES, 0 NAYS ON THE ADOPTION OF COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS. [LB474]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SPEAKER HADLEY: THE TRANSPORTATION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE AMENDMENT IS ADOPTED. IS THERE ANYONE WISHING TO SPEAK ON THE ADVANCEMENT OF LB474? SEEING NONE, SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE ON LB474. [LB474]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, I DID NOT HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO SEE THE PROGRAM WHEN IT FIRST AIRED ON 60 MINUTES THAT SENATOR CAMPBELL MENTIONED. BUT I GO TO BED LATE, I GET UP EARLY, SO I SAW IT ON AN EARLY-MORNING REPLAY. AND THESE ANIMALS ARE REFERRED TO AS NEIGHBORS. THEY SHOWED HOW SOME OF THESE CAMERAS WILL CAPTURE THEM, AS SENATOR CAMPBELL POINTED OUT, IN NEIGHBORHOODS. THESE ANIMALS HAVE BOTHERED NOBODY. HIKERS, PICNICKERS GO WHERE THESE ANIMALS LIVE HOPING THEY'LL SEE ONE. BUT THESE ARE KNOWN AS THE GHOST CATS OF THE PRAIRIE BECAUSE THEY DON'T WANT TO BE SEEN. THEY LIVE WHERE THERE IS A LOT OF COVER EITHER IN THE FORM OF ROCKY TERRAIN OR TREES, AND THEY DO NOT BOTHER LIVESTOCK. BUT HERE'S WHERE A PROBLEM COMES IN. THESE OFFSPRING ARE KNOWN AS KITTENS. AND THE MOTHER TEACHES THEM, AS ALL MOTHERS DO THEIR YOUNG, WHAT IS APPROPRIATE AND WHAT IS NOT. THEY TEACH THEM TO AVOID LIVESTOCK, TO AVOID HUMANS, AND LET THEM KNOW THAT YOUR PREY-- COYOTES, RACCOONS, DEER, OTHER WILDLIFE. BUT A PROBLEM ARISES IF THAT MOTHER IS KILLED. THEN LIKE YOUNG EVERYWHERE WITHOUT BEING TRAINED, WITHOUT BEING TAUGHT THEY ARE THE ONES MOST LIKELY TO HAVE AN INAPPROPRIATE CONTACT WITH A HUMAN BEING. BUT EVEN THEN, THE ANIMAL IS NOT GOING TO BE THE AGGRESSOR. THEY DON'T WANT TO BE SEEN. THEY WILL AVOID HUMAN BEINGS. AND THE PART THAT SENATOR CAMPBELL MENTIONED THAT WAS AMAZING TO ME WHEN I SAW IT ON THE PROGRAM WAS THE PICTURE OF THESE MULTI-LANE HIGHWAYS AND THEY DRIVE FAST IN CALIFORNIA. AT THE RATE THAT I DRIVE, AND I DRIVE THE SPEED LIMIT, I'D PROBABLY GET RUN OVER. BUT TO BE ABLE TO WIND YOUR WAY ACROSS ONE OF THOSE HIGHWAYS AND NOT BE HIT WHEN IN NEBRASKA THEY ARE RUN OVER ON ORDINARY ROADS--AND I THINK SOMETIMES THERE MIGHT BE AN ATTEMPT TO DO IT, BUT THAT'S ANOTHER ISSUE--SHOWS THE AMAZING INTELLIGENCE OF THESE ANIMALS. AND I HAD HEARD ABOUT THE INTENT TO TRY TO BUILD THIS OVERPASS IN THE AREA WHERE THEY ORDINARILY WOULD CROSS THIS INTERSTATE OR THIS MULTI-LANE HIGHWAY SO THAT THEY WOULDN'T BE KILLED. AND I HAVE TO SAY TO SENATOR SCHNOOR IF HE WOULD RESPOND TO A QUESTION OR TWO. [LB474]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR SCHNOOR, WILL YOU YIELD TO A QUESTION?
[LB474]

SENATOR SCHNOOR: YES, SIR. [LB474]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SENATOR SCHNOOR, FIRST I WANT TO SAY TOUCHE. HE'S A LOT YOUNGER THAN I SO I CAN SAY THIS: IN YOUR LINE OF QUESTIONING, SONNY, YOU KIND OF REMINDED ME OF MYSELF. BUT HERE'S THE QUESTION I WILL ASK YOU, WHAT DO YOU CALL IT WHEN YOU CROSS A MULTI-LANE HIGHWAY WITH A BICYCLIST? [LB474]

SENATOR SCHNOOR: I DO NOT KNOW. [LB474]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: A TRAFFIC FATALITY. (LAUGHTER) THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. THAT'S ALL THAT I HAVE. [LB474]

SPEAKER HADLEY: YOU'VE HEARD THE CLOSING ON LB474. THE QUESTION IS THE ADVANCEMENT OF LB474 TO E&R INITIAL. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR VOTE AYE; OPPOSED VOTE NAY. HAVE ALL VOTED? RECORD, MR. CLERK. [LB474]

ASSISTANT CLERK: 38 AYES, 0 NAYS ON THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE BILL, MR. PRESIDENT. [LB474]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THE BILL ADVANCES TO E&R INITIAL. MR. CLERK. [LB474]

ASSISTANT CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, THE NEXT BILL, LB474A WHICH WAS INTRODUCED BY SENATOR CHAMBERS. (TITLE READ.) [LB474A]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON LB474A. [LB474A]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE BECAUSE THIS BILL DID NOT MOVE LAST YEAR THERE ARE CHANGERS IN THE DATES, AND THAT'S ALL THAT IT DOES. SO I'LL ASK YOU TO ADOPT THE AMENDMENT TO THE A BILL WHICH WAS APPROPRIATELY DRAFTED BY BILL DRAFTING. THANK YOU. [LB474A]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

ASSISTANT CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT. SENATOR CHAMBERS HAS OFFERED AM1934. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGES 446-447.) [LB474A]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE NOW RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON YOUR AMENDMENT. [LB474A]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. FOR THOSE WHO WERE LISTENING, I'D JUST SAY DITTO. THIS CORRECTS SOME DATES THAT WOULD HAVE TO BE CORRECTED BECAUSE THE BILL DID NOT MOVE LAST YEAR, AND IT WAS LAST YEAR'S VERSION THAT THE A BILL WAS DRAFTED FOR. SO SINCE THIS WOULD BE '16-17 INSTEAD OF '15-16, THAT IS THE CHANGE THAT THE A BILL MAKES. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LB474A]

SPEAKER HADLEY: IS THERE ANYONE WISHING TO SPEAK ON AM1934? SEEING NONE, SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE ON YOUR AMENDMENT. SENATOR CHAMBERS WAIVES CLOSING. THE QUESTION FOR THE BODY IS THE ADOPTION OF AM1934. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY VOTING AYE; OPPOSED VOTE NAY. RECORD, MR. CLERK. [LB474A]

ASSISTANT CLERK: 36 AYES, 0 NAYS ON THE ADOPTION OF THE AMENDMENT. [LB474A]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THE AMENDMENT IS ADOPTED. SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE ON LB474A. [LB474A]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: MR. PRESIDENT, SENATOR SCHNOOR TOOK ADVANTAGE OF ME THIS MORNING, FOLLOWED BY SENATOR KRIST. THEN THIS WAS NOT SENATOR HUGHES' DOING, BUT WE WERE DISCUSSING A SUBJECT THAT WILL TAKE PRIORITY FOR ME OVER EVERYTHING ELSE, AND IT'S SOMETHING BEING DONE FOR A CHILD. SO I MISSED VOTING FOR THE AMENDMENT, BUT I AM ASKING THAT YOU VOTE TO ADVANCE THIS BILL. AND I SHALL STAY HERE AND VOTE FOR IT BEFORE I GO TO THE MORE IMPORTANT BUSINESS THAT I WAS ENGAGED IN A FEW SECONDS AGO. THANK YOU. [LB474A]

SPEAKER HADLEY: YOU'VE HEARD THE CLOSING ON LB474A. THE VOTE IS TO ADVANCE LB474A TO E&R INITIAL. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY VOTING AYE; OPPOSED VOTE NAY. RECORD, MR. CLERK. [LB474A]

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

ASSISTANT CLERK: 38 AYES, 0 NAYS ON THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE BILL, MR. PRESIDENT. [LB474A]

SPEAKER HADLEY: LB474A ADVANCES TO E&R INITIAL. MR. CLERK. MR. CLERK FOR ITEMS. [LB474A]

ASSISTANT CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, I DO HAVE ITEMS. A NEW RESOLUTION: LR425 BY SENATOR PANSING BROOKS; THAT WILL BE LAID OVER. I HAVE THREE CONFIRMATION REPORTS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE. YOUR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE REPORTS LB909 AS WELL AS LB921 TO GENERAL FILE. A NOTICE OF COMMITTEE HEARING FROM THE REVENUE COMMITTEE. THAT'S ALL I HAVE AT THIS TIME. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGES 447-448.) [LR425 LB909 LB921]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, MR. CLERK. THE NEXT ITEM ON THE AGENDA.

ASSISTANT CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, THE NEXT ITEM IS LR26CA INTRODUCED BY SENATOR LARSON. IT IS A PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE AND CHANGE ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLIC OFFICE. THE BILL WAS REFERRED TO THE GOVERNMENT, MILITARY AND VETERANS AFFAIRS COMMITTEE. THAT COMMITTEE PLACED THE BILL ON GENERAL FILE WITH NO COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR LARSON, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON YOUR LR26CA. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, AND GOOD MORNING, COLLEAGUES. I STAND BEFORE YOU TODAY TO PRESENT LR26CA, A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT THAT WOULD CHANGE THE AGE OF ELIGIBILITY TO RUN FOR PUBLIC OFFICE TO THE FEDERAL VOTING AGE. THIS MEASURE WAS HEARD BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 20, 2015, AND WAS ADVANCED TO GENERAL FILE WITH A 7-1 VOTE. CURRENTLY IN NEBRASKA, THE AGE TO RUN FOR THE LEGISLATURE IS SET AT 21 YEARS AND THE AGE TO RUN FOR GOVERNOR AND LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR IS 30 YEARS AND THE CHIEF JUSTICE OR JUDGE OF THE SUPREME COURT IS 30 YEARS AS WELL. LR26CA WOULD LOWER THE MINIMUM AGE TO RUN FOR ANY PUBLIC OFFICE, WHETHER ELECTED OR APPOINTED, TO 18 OR THE FEDERAL VOTING AGE IN THIS CASE. THE AMENDMENT WOULD BE PLACED ON THE NOVEMBER 2016 GENERAL ELECTION BALLOT. THIS IS A STRAIGHTFORWARD CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT BUT IT IS

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

AN IMPORTANT ONE. I WOULD LIKE TO OFFER SOME HISTORY ON WHY THE AGE IS CURRENTLY 21 YEARS OLD FOR THE NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE. WHEN GEORGE NORRIS ENVISIONED THE UNICAMERAL IN 1934, THE STANDARD VOTING AGE ACROSS AMERICA WAS 21 YEARS OF AGE. THE FACT THAT GEORGE NORRIS REALIZED THAT IT WOULD BE A DISENFRANCHISEMENT OF AN INDIVIDUAL'S RIGHTS TO NOT LET THEM SERVE IN THE NEW NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE I BELIEVE IS VERY TELLING. HOWEVER, WHEN THE TWENTY-SIXTH AMENDMENT WAS RATIFIED IN 1971, THE MINIMUM FEDERAL VOTING AGE DROPPED THE AGE TO 18, LEAVING THE NEBRASKA CONSTITUTION BEHIND THE INTENT OF ITS MAKERS AND GEORGE NORRIS. THIS IS AN ATTEMPT TO RETURN THE BALANCE OF THE NEBRASKA CONSTITUTION THAT GEORGE NORRIS ENVISIONED 80 YEARS AGO. IF 18-YEAR-OLDS ARE OLD ENOUGH TO EXERCISE THEIR RIGHT TO VOTE, THEY SHOULD HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO SERVE AS AN ELECTED MEMBER OF THE LEGISLATURE OR ANY OTHER OFFICE. LIMITING AN INDIVIDUAL'S ABILITY TO RUN UNTIL THEY ARE 21 OR EVEN 30 RESTRICTS THAT PERSON'S RIGHT TO REPRESENT THE ISSUES AND IDEAS THAT ARE IMPORTANT TO THEM AND THEIR POTENTIAL CONSTITUENTS. IT ALSO LIMITS A VOTER'S RIGHT TO ELECT THE PERSON THEY CONSIDER TO BE THE BEST CANDIDATE FOR THE JOB. IF A VOTER FEELS AN 18-YEAR-OLD WOULD BE THE BEST PERSON TO REPRESENT THEM, THOSE VOTERS SHOULD HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO CHOOSE THAT PERSON. SEVENTEEN OTHER STATES ALLOW INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE AT LEAST 18 YEARS OLD TO RUN FOR A POSITION IN THEIR STATE LEGISLATURES. THE SAME CHANCE SHOULD BE EXTENDED TO THOSE WHO ARE AT LEAST 18 YEARS OLD IN NEBRASKA AS WELL. INDIVIDUALS WHO ALREADY HOLD THE RIGHT TO VOTE AND FEEL QUALIFIED AND MOTIVATED TO SERVE SHOULD HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE THEIR CASE TO VOTERS. ANY INDIVIDUAL WHO BELIEVES THAT JUST BECAUSE ONE IS YOUNG MEANS THEY ARE UNFIT TO SERVE, I BELIEVE, IS DISCOUNTING THE PEOPLE OF NEBRASKA. NEBRASKANS SHOULD BE ABLE TO CHOOSE WHOM THEY BELIEVE WILL BEST REPRESENT THEM IN THE NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE AS WELL AS ANY OTHER ELECTED OR APPOINTED PUBLIC OFFICE. THE ISSUE IS A CORE FIRST AMENDMENT ISSUE. WE ARE CURRENTLY INFRINGING NOT ONLY ON THE FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THOSE INDIVIDUALS THAT ARE NOT ABLE TO RUN FOR THESE OFFICES BUT THE FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THOSE WHO ARE NOT ABLE TO POSSIBLY ELECT THE BEST-SUITED PERSON TO REPRESENT THEM IN PUBLIC OFFICE, INCLUDING THE NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE. GIVING THOSE WHO ARE ELIGIBLE TO VOTE THE ABILITY TO RUN FOR OFFICE ENSURES THAT OUR RESIDENTS WILL HAVE THE ABILITY TO FULLY PARTICIPATE IN THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND I WOULD URGE A GREEN VOTE ON LR26CA. [LR26CA]

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SPEAKER HADLEY: YOU'VE HEARD THE OPENING ON LR26CA. THOSE IN THE QUEUE ARE HARR, BLOOMFIELD, SCHNOOR, SCHUMACHER, AND BAKER. SENATOR HARR, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR HARR: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER, MEMBERS OF THE BODY. YOU KNOW, AT FIRST GLANCE I LIKE THIS CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, BUT WE HAVE TO LOOK AT THE BIG PICTURE. AND STANDING UP HERE EARLIER THIS YEAR, OUR GOVERNOR SAID PROPERTY TAXES ARE OUR NUMBER ONE PRIORITY. AND I KNOW THIS DOESN'T HAVE A FISCAL NOTE ON IT, BUT I WORRY ABOUT THE COST OF CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, TO PUT THOSE ON THE BALLOT. WILL SENATOR LARSON YIELD TO A QUESTION? [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR LARSON, WILL YOU YIELD? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: YES. [LR26CA]

SENATOR HARR: DO YOU KNOW HOW MUCH THIS WOULD COST TO PUT ON THE BALLOT? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: I DON'T THINK THE FISCAL NOTE SAID, SO I AM UNSURE. I'M SORRY, SENATOR HARR. [LR26CA]

SENATOR HARR: WOULD YOU ARGUE THAT IT'S DE MINIMIS? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: I WOULD ARGUE THAT IT WOULD BE MINIMAL TO PUT ON THE BALLOT, BUT I DON'T HAVE AN EXACT NUMBER. I'M SORRY, SENATOR HARR. [LR26CA]

SENATOR HARR: OKAY, THANK YOU. IT'S JUST I WORRY BECAUSE OUR COUNTIES WILL HAVE TO PAY FOR THIS. AND THE MAIN WAY THEY GET MONEY IS PROPERTY TAXES. AND I WOULD HATE TO HAVE TO PUT A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON THE BALLOT IF IT'S JUST GOING TO COST OUR COUNTIES MONEY. BUT THANK YOU FOR THAT CLARIFICATION. I'M GLAD THAT PUTTING A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON THE BALLOT IS DE MINIMIS. AND I PLAN TO SUPPORT AND I'D ASK MY COLLEAGUES TO PLEASE SUPPORT LR26CA. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR HARR. SENATOR BLOOMFIELD, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. GOOD MORNING, COLLEAGUES. GUESS WHO THE ONE VOTE WAS? I CAN'T SUPPORT THIS. FOR PETE'S SAKE, IF WE ELECTED AN 18-YEAR-OLD GOVERNOR, HE WOULDN'T BE ABLE TO BUY A BEER TO CELEBRATE. LET'S LOOK AT WHAT WE'RE DOING. WE HAVE TALKED ABOUT MANY, MANY TIMES IN HERE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE HUMAN BRAIN AND THAT IT'S NOT DEVELOPED BY THE TIME YOU'RE 21 OR 18, FOR PETE'S SAKE. UNTIL 25 IS IT DEVELOPED. THE IDEA THAT WE WOULD EVEN EXPOSE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ELECT AN 18-YEAR-OLD TO SERVE AS GOVERNOR IS ABHORRENT TO ME. I CERTAINLY DON'T INTEND TO TAKE THIS TO A SIX-HOUR DISCUSSION. I HOPE WE DON'T HAVE TO. I WILL DROP IN AN AMENDMENT TO BRACKET IT. AND, COLLEAGUES, IF WE HAVEN'T DONE ANYTHING SERIOUS THIS SESSION SO FAR, AND I THINK WE HAVE, THIS IS ANOTHER ONE WE OUGHT TO LOOK AT. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR BLOOMFIELD. SENATOR SCHNOOR, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHNOOR: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER. SENATOR LARSON, WILL YOU YIELD TO A QUESTION, PLEASE? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: YES. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR LARSON, WILL YOU YIELD? [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHNOOR: AND I APOLOGIZE, SENATOR LARSON, FOR KIND OF CATCHING YOU OFF GUARD ON THIS. A CLARIFICATION, YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT PUBLIC OFFICE, YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT ANY ELECTED OFFICE IN THE STATE OF NEBRASKA TO INCLUDE, I'LL SAY SCHOOL BOARDS, CITY COUNCIL, ALL THE WAY UP TO THE GOVERNOR? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: CORRECT. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHNOOR: OKAY, THANK YOU. THAT CLARIFIES ONE QUESTION. MY NEXT QUESTION, ARE THERE AGE RESTRICTIONS OTHER THAN WHAT YOU HAVE GIVEN US HERE ON YOUR HANDOUT? YOU SPECIFIED FOR LEGISLATURES. ARE THERE AGE RESTRICTIONS FOR THOSE OTHER POSITIONS SUCH AS SCHOOL BOARDS, CITY COUNCILS, AND THOSE THAT WE DEAL WITH MORE OFTEN IN SMALL COMMUNITIES? [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SENATOR LARSON: YEAH, IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING THAT A CITY COUNCIL OR...SPECIFICALLY A CITY COUNCIL, I DON'T KNOW IF ANY SCHOOL BOARDS HAVE ANY AGE RESTRICTIONS, BUT A CITY COUNCIL COULD HAVE AN ORDINANCE THAT SAYS YOU HAVE TO BE SO OLD TO RUN FOR THAT OFFICE. I'M UNSURE HOW MANY THERE ARE. I'M NOT SURE IF THERE'S ACTUALLY ANY THAT DO HAVE AGE RESTRICTIONS OVER THE AGE OF 18 IN NEBRASKA. WITH GOVERNOR AND LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR CURRENTLY IN THIS STATE, IT IS 30 YEARS OLD. AND I'LL ADDRESS SENATOR BLOOMFIELD'S CONCERNS ON MY OWN TIME; I DON'T WANT TO USE YOURS. BUT...OR IF YOU WANT TO GIVE IT TO ME WHEN YOU'RE DONE, I CAN DIRECTLY ADDRESS THEM. BUT THERE ARE SOME AGE RESTRICTIONS FOR LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR AND GOVERNOR, AND THEN OBVIOUSLY LEGISLATURE IS 21. BUT GEORGE NORRIS DIDN'T ENVISION THE FEDERAL VOTING AGE DROPPING DOWN EITHER. AND I THINK WE HAVE TO UNDERSTAND WE NEED TO TRUST THE PEOPLE AND THAT THEY CAN MAKE AN EDUCATED DECISION FOR THEMSELVES. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHNOOR: OKAY, THANK YOU. AND I APOLOGIZE FOR CATCHING YOU OFF GUARD, AND I WILL YIELD YOU THE REST OF MY TIME. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR SCHUMACHER, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: WHOA, WHOA. HE YIELDED ME HIS TIME. DO I GET HIS? [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: I'M SORRY, I THOUGHT YOU...SENATOR LARSON, YOU'RE YIELDED 3:00. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. (LAUGH) YOU KNOW, SENATOR BLOOMFIELD SAID THAT...TRIED TO BRING UP THE DEVELOPMENT OF ADOLESCENT BRAINS AND THAT MAKES THEM THAT THEY SHOULDN'T BE ABLE TO EVEN STAND FOR OFFICE. WELL, YOU KNOW, COLLEAGUES, I HAVE A PROBLEM WITH THAT. IF HIS ARGUMENT IS TO CARRY ANY WATER AT ALL, ESSENTIALLY THE ELECTION PROCESS SHOULD TAKE CARE OF ITSELF. WHAT SENATOR BLOOMFIELD IS SAYING IS HE DOESN'T TRUST THE VOTERS OF NEBRASKA TO MAKE A DECISION FOR THEMSELVES OF WHO THEY THINK IS BEST TO REPRESENT THEM, AND THAT'S UNFORTUNATE. HE'S SAYING HE DOESN'T TRUST NEBRASKANS. THAT IS WHAT HE'S SAYING. HE DOESN'T TRUST YOU TO DECIDE TO VOTE FOR WHO YOU THINK IS BEST TO REPRESENT YOU. YOU KNOW WHAT, NEBRASKA, I HAVE A TRUST IN YOU THAT YOU KNOW WHO, OUT

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

OF ANY POSSIBLE CANDIDATE, WILL DO THE BEST JOB THAT THEY CAN OR REPRESENT THE ISSUES THAT YOU CARE ABOUT. I BELIEVE IN YOU. SENATOR BLOOMFIELD MIGHT NOT, BUT I DO. AND IF HIS ARGUMENT, THAT THEY SHOULDN'T EVEN BE ABLE TO STAND FOR OFFICE, IF YOU DON'T THINK THAT THEY'RE UNABLE...OR IF THEY ARE UNFIT OR UNABLE, THERE'S A SIMPLE SOLUTION TO THAT--IT'S TO NOT VOTE FOR THAT INDIVIDUAL, SIMPLE AS THAT. SENATOR BLOOMFIELD ARGUES ABOUT PUTTING LR26CA EVEN ON THE BALLOT FOR YOU TO VOTE FOR. THIS DOESN'T MAKE IT SO. THIS STILL GOES TO THE VOTERS OF NEBRASKA. LET THE PEOPLE... [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: ONE MINUTE? [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: YES. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE FOR THEMSELVES. SENATOR BLOOMFIELD ARGUES AGAINST THIS. HE DOESN'T EVEN WANT YOU TO HAVE THE ABILITY TO DECIDE THIS, AND THAT'S UNFORTUNATE. I KNOW IN COMMITTEE WE HEARD DURING THE HEARING, I HOPE SENATOR GARRETT DOESN'T MIND, BUT I REMEMBER ONE OF HIS COMMENTS IN COMMITTEE AND I'M HOPING HE STANDS UP AND SAYS THE SAME THING. AS A MILITARY MAN, IF YOU ARE OLD ENOUGH TO GET SENT TO PULL A TRIGGER, YOU SHOULD BE OLD ENOUGH TO PUSH A RED OR GREEN BUTTON IN THIS BODY. AND IT'S AS SIMPLE AS THAT. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR SCHNOOR AND SENATOR LARSON. SENATOR SCHUMACHER, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER, MEMBERS OF THE BODY. WE USED TO BE ABLE TO DO THINGS BY PETITION, AND WE COULD PUT ANY NUMBER OF DIFFERENT SUBJECTS INTO AN INITIATIVE PETITION. AND THEN THE LEGISLATURE PROPOSED AN AMENDMENT, I THINK IT WAS IN THE LATE 1980s OR 1990s, THAT SAID INITIATIVE PETITION MATTERS SHALL BE SUBJECT TO ONE SUBJECT ONLY. AND I THINK WHEN MOST OF US VOTED ON THAT WE THOUGHT THAT WAS A PRETTY GOOD IDEA. WE WOULDN'T WANT MOTORCYCLE HELMETS AND PROPERTY TAXES TO BE IN THE SAME PETITION BECAUSE WE MIGHT BE FOR ONE OR THE OTHER. WE SHOULDN'T HAVE TO, IN ORDER TO GET ONE, HAVE THE OTHER. WELL, COURTS DO WHAT COURTS DO. AND THEY BEGAN TO SPLIT

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

HAIRS OVER WHAT A SINGLE SUBJECT WAS. AND WE STILL THOUGHT, WELL, THAT JUST APPLIES TO THOSE NASTY PETITIONERS, CERTAINLY WOULDN'T APPLY TO THE LEGISLATURE. THEY CERTAINLY WOULDN'T SPLIT HAIRS OVER SINGLE-SUBJECT ISSUES WITH THE LEGISLATURE. WELL, WE SHOULD LEARN FROM OUR MISTAKES BECAUSE THEY CERTAINLY DID SPLIT HAIRS ON THE DEAD HORSE RACING THING WE TRIED TO PUT ON THE BALLOT. NOBODY IN HERE, INCLUDING MYSELF, CAUGHT THAT THAT WAS TWO SUBJECTS, PROHIBITED. THE COURT SAID, HEY, YOU SUBDIVIDE IT. SO LET'S LOOK AT THE DEFECTS IN LR26CA, HOW MANY DIFFERENT SUBJECTS IT IS. WELL, WE DEAL WITH THE LEGISLATURE BEING ABLE TO BE...AND FOR ALL PRACTICAL PURPOSES, ANY PUBLIC OFFICE TO BE AT 18 INSTEAD OF THE PRESENT VOTING AGE. OKAY, THAT'S ONE SUBJECT. THE SECOND SUBJECT IN HERE, IT EXTENDS THIS LIMITATION THAT IF YOU ARE APPOINTED TO THE LEGISLATURE THAT YOU HAVE TO LIVE IN THE DISTRICT FOR AT LEAST SIX MONTHS. WHETHER YOU'RE FOR OR AGAINST THAT, IT'S ANOTHER ISSUE AND IT'S A CHANGE. THIRD ISSUE, AT LEAST, WE EXTEND THIS RULE TO THE SUPREME COURT CHIEF JUSTICE, SUB ISSUE, AND ALL THE JUSTICES, SUB ISSUE. EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLD CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT? NOT EVEN ENOUGH AGE TO GET OUT OF LAW SCHOOL. NOW I MIGHT BE FOR SAYING, HEY, LET'S LET PEOPLE VOTE AT 18. I CERTAINLY WOULD BE QUESTIONING THE WISDOM OF A CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT. SO YOU PUT ME IN A TWO-SUBJECT SITUATION. I'VE GOT TO SAY YES TO THE CHIEF JUSTICE EVEN THOUGH I REALLY DON'T WANT TO. AND I THINK THAT THE 18 FOR A MEMBER OF THE LEGISLATURE WOULD BE JUST FINE. CAN'T DO IT. IF WE'RE GOING TO PURSUE THIS ROAD, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO DIVIDE THIS QUESTION FOR THE VOTERS. THEY SHOULD NOT BE, CANNOT BE, UNDER OUR CONSTITUTION, SUBJECT TO CHOOSING BETWEEN CONFLICTING BELIEFS TO GET ONE BELIEF PASSED. SO I THINK THAT IF WE WERE TO PUT THIS ON THE BALLOT TODAY AND IT WERE CHALLENGED, IT WOULD GO OUT THE WINDOW. SO IF WE'RE GOING TO GO DOWN THIS ROAD, THEN WE NEED TO SUBDIVIDE THIS QUESTION FOR THE VOTERS AND MAKE IT AT LEAST TWO, IF NOT THREE OR FOUR SEPARATE QUESTIONS ON THE BALLOT. AND IF WE WANT TO RUN... [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: ...RUN THROUGH THE COST OF JUST ROLLING THE DICE, WE CAN ROLL THE DICE. BUT CHANCES ARE WE'LL END UP IN THE SAME GRAVEYARD AS THE DEAD HORSES. THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: (VISITORS INTRODUCED.) MR. CLERK. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

ASSISTANT CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, I HAVE A PRIORITY MOTION. SENATOR BLOOMFIELD WOULD MOVE TO BRACKET LR26CA TO APRIL 20. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR BLOOMFIELD, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON YOUR BRACKET MOTION. [LR26CA]

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. GOOD MORNING, NEBRASKA. SENATOR LARSON SAID THAT I DON'T CARE ABOUT NEBRASKA. I DON'T THINK YOU'RE SMART ENOUGH. NOTHING COULD BE FURTHER FROM THE TRUTH. WE ARE SENT HERE AS LEGISLATORS TO DECIDE ISSUES. IF WE'RE GOING TO DUMP EVERYTHING BACK ON TO THE BALLOT AND LET EVERY SINGLE ITEM GO TO A VOTE OF THE PEOPLE, WE MAY AS WELL ADJOURN TODAY. THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE COULD SEND OUT A BUNCH OF NUMBERS AND SEE IF YOU WANTED TO APPROVE THAT AS A BUDGET ITEM. IT MIGHT TAKE A LITTLE LONGER, BUT YOU WOULDN'T HAVE TO PAY US THE WHOLE \$12,000 A YEAR. COLLEAGUES, WHICH OF YOU WANT AN 18-YEAR-OLD CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT? WE CAN STAND HERE AND SAY, OH, THE PEOPLE WOULD NEVER DO THAT. NO, THE PEOPLE WOULDN'T. BUT SAY DOWN THE ROAD TEN YEARS, SENATOR LARSON MIGHT BE ELECTED GOVERNOR. AND DO YOU THINK HE MIGHT APPOINT AN 18-YEAR-OLD TO A COURT SOMEWHERE OR THE SUPREME COURT? IT CAN HAPPEN. THAT'S WHY WE'RE HERE--TO KEEP NONSENSE FROM HAPPENING. IT'S AS IMPORTANT AS MAKING GOOD THINGS HAPPEN--PROBABLY MORE IMPORTANT THAN MAKING GOOD THINGS HAPPEN IS TO STOP BAD LEGISLATION. AND IN MY MIND, THAT'S WHAT THIS IS. I THINK IT NEEDS TO BE BRACKETED AND LET ANOTHER GROUP LOOK AT IT. SENATOR SCHUMACHER BROUGHT UP SOME VERY GOOD POINTS. BUT THOSE FALL ON DEAF EARS SOMETIMES OR ON EARS TOO YOUNG TO REACH THAT GRAVE A DECISION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT WE SHOULD HAVE AN 18-YEAR-OLD CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OR AN 18-YEAR-OLD GOVERNOR. YOU KNOW, I DON'T KNOW THAT I WOULD OPPOSE AN 18-YEAR-OLD STATE SENATOR. THEY CAN COME IN HERE. THEY CAN BE MELLOWED OUT BY 48 OTHERS. THEY CAN BE EDUCATED. BUT WHEN WE START TALKING SUPREME COURT JUSTICES, JUDGES, GOVERNORS, LIEUTENANT GOVERNORS, THAT'S A BRIDGE TOO FAR. SO I ASK THAT YOU SUPPORT MY BRACKET MOTION AND LET'S NOT SPEND A LOT OF TIME ON THIS. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR BLOOMFIELD. THOSE IN THE QUEUE ARE SENATORS BAKER, HANSEN, EBKE, MORFELD, SCHILZ, AND NUMEROUS OTHERS. SENATOR BAKER, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SENATOR BAKER: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I HAVE SOME INTEREST IN WHAT SENATOR LARSON HAS PROPOSED. I'M GOING TO PUT IT IN A LITTLE BIT DIFFERENT CONTEXT. YOU KNOW, PROBABLY MORE THAN HALF THIS BODY WAS NOT AROUND DURING THE 1960s. BUT THAT'S WHEN I CAME OF AGE. AND BACK IN THE '60s, THERE WAS THE VIETNAM WAR GOING ON AND THERE WAS A DRAFT. THERE WERE 18-YEAR-OLDS WHO WERE DRAFTED, DIDN'T VOLUNTEER. THEY WERE REQUIRED TO GO TO FIGHT FOR THEIR COUNTRY. SO AT THAT TIME THERE CAME A WHOLE LOT OF REASON...HEY, IF YOU'RE OLD ENOUGH TO BE REQUIRED TO GO TO WAR FOR YOUR COUNTRY, EVEN AGAINST YOUR WILL, THEN YOU'RE OLD ENOUGH TO DO A LOT OF OTHER THINGS. I RESPECT SENATOR SCHUMACHER TREMENDOUSLY, AND HE'S POINTED OUT SOME THINGS THAT WOULD NEED TO BE WORKED OUT TO MAKE THIS EVEN POSSIBLE. BUT I WOULD ALSO SAY THAT THE IDEA THAT 18-YEAR-OLDS ARE SOMEHOW INTELLECTUALLY INFERIOR TO THE REST OF US WOULD NOT BE VALID. I KNOW AT NORRIS AND AT BEATRICE WE HAD AN APPOINTED NONVOTING STUDENT MEMBER ON OUR SCHOOL BOARD. AND YOU WOULD BE SURPRISED HOW OFTEN THOSE PEOPLE WERE ABLE TO PROVIDE INSIGHTS THAT OTHER ELECTED MEMBERS OF THE BOARD WOULD LOOK TO BEFORE THEY WOULD MAKE THEIR DECISION. SO I THINK THAT...YOU KNOW, I'VE BEEN CONSTANTLY AMAZED, BEING AROUND YOUNG PEOPLE MOST OF MY LIFE, HOW TREMENDOUSLY TALENTED MANY OF THESE PEOPLE ARE WHO COULD DO THINGS, THAT HAVE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS THAT I NEVER HAD. SO I DO NOT THINK THAT AN 18-YEAR-OLD IS INHERENTLY INFERIOR OR UNABLE TO SERVE IN A LOT OF THESE CAPACITIES SUCH AS THE LEGISLATURE. AS FAR AS THE DETAILS, IMPORTANT DETAIL THAT SENATOR SCHUMACHER POINTED OUT, I AGREE THOSE THINGS...THERE ARE SOME ISSUES THERE THAT HAVE TO BE WORKED OUT. BUT I'M NOT OPPOSED TO THE IDEA OF ALLOWING MORE OPPORTUNITIES FOR 18-YEAR-OLDS TO HOLD OFFICE. I YIELD THE REMAINDER OF MY TIME TO SENATOR LARSON. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR LARSON, YOU'RE YIELDED 2:35. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: THANK YOU, SENATOR BAKER. COLLEAGUES, WE HEARD SENATOR SCHUMACHER DISCUSS THE TWO-SUBJECT RULE AND BRING UP THE HORSE RACING. LET ME REFRESH YOU A LITTLE BIT ON WHAT THAT EXACTLY WAS. WE WERE ESSENTIALLY ASKING ON THE HISTORIC HORSE RACING, WE WERE ASKING THEM NOT ONLY TO APPROVE THE HISTORIC HORSE RACING BUT THE SECOND SUBJECT IN THAT WAS GOING DIRECTLY TO WHERE THE MONEY RAISED BY THAT WOULD BE USED. THAT'S TWO SUBJECTS. YOU HAD THE DIRECT APPROVAL OF X, AND WHERE THE MONEY RAISED BY THAT IS Y. THAT'S TWO

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SUBJECTS. THIS IS NOT TWO SUBJECTS. IT IS ONE SINGLE SUBJECT IN THE SENSE OF ONLY DEALING WITH THE VOTING AGE FOR ALL PUBLIC OFFICES. SO SENATOR SCHUMACHER'S ARGUMENT THAT THIS IS MULTIPLE SUBJECTS IS JUST PATENTLY FALSE. SECOND OF ALL, WE HEAR THE ARGUMENT THAT, OH, WE COULD HAVE AN 18-YEAR-OLD SUPREME COURT CHIEF JUSTICE. YOU KNOW WHAT? IN THEORY THAT IS TRUE, BUT THEY WOULD HAVE TO MEET EVERY OTHER QUALIFICATION TO DO SO. THOSE QUALIFICATIONS ARE YOU HAVE TO HAVE A LAW DEGREE. I BELIEVE YOU HAVE TO HAVE BEEN PRACTICING FOR FIVE YEARS MEANING THAT KID WOULD HAVE HAD TO HAVE HIS LAW DEGREE AT 10. YOU KNOW WHAT? IF YOU HAVE A LAW DEGREE AT 10, YOU'RE PROBABLY ONE OF THE SMARTEST PEOPLE TO EVER WALK THIS EARTH TO BE COMPLETELY FRANK. YOU MIGHT ACTUALLY BE QUALIFIED AT 18 TO BE THE SUPREME COURT JUSTICE. I MEAN, WHAT'S THAT MEAN? YOU GRADUATED HIGH SCHOOL AT 7 TO GO GET... [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: ...YOUR UNDERGRAD? I MEAN, LET'S BE SERIOUS. IF YOU'RE THAT SMART, THEN MAYBE, JUST MAYBE, YOUR BRAIN IS DEVELOPED ENOUGH TO BE THE SUPREME COURT JUSTICE. COLLEAGUES, FIRST OF ALL, THIS IS NOT SINGLE SUBJECT. I HAVE OUTLINED THE MULTIPLE-SUBJECT RULE THAT SENATOR SCHUMACHER TRIED TO PULL TOGETHER. ALL IT HAS TO DEAL WITH IS ONE SINGLE SUBJECT AND IT'S POLITICAL OFFICE...ELECTED TO POLITICAL OFFICES. WE'RE NOT...BECAUSE WE'RE DEALING WITH LEGISLATURE AND SUPREME COURT, IT'S STILL POLITICAL OFFICES. SO I APPRECIATE THE CONCERN, BUT IT'S NOT MULTIPLE SUBJECTS. AND THE CONCERN THAT WE HAVE AN 18-YEAR-OLD SUPREME COURT JUSTICE, YOU KNOW, IF THEY'RE SMART ENOUGH TO HIT ALL THOSE QUALIFICATIONS AT 18, I GUARANTEE THEY'RE SMARTER THAN EVERY ONE OF US IN THIS ROOM. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: TIME, SENATOR. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR BAKER. THANK YOU, SENATOR LARSON. SENATOR HANSEN, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR HANSEN: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I RISE IN SUPPORT OF LR26CA AND AGAINST SENATOR BLOOMFIELD'S BRACKET MOTION. I SUPPORTED THIS

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

BILL OUT OF COMMITTEE AND ACTUALLY JUST THIS MORNING AGREED TO SIGN ON AS A COSPONSOR. IT'S A LITTLE INTERESTING TO HEAR THIS DEBATE ABOUT YOUNG PEOPLE HAVING THEIR BRAINS FULLY DEVELOPED TO BE AN ELECTED OFFICIAL BEING CURRENTLY THE YOUNGEST ELECTED MEMBER OF THIS BODY. SO THAT'S JUST BEEN AN INTERESTING THING TO HEAR AND TO FOCUS UPON. MY THOUGHT FOR SUPPORTING THIS IS WE NOW HAVE A SITUATION IN WHICH AN 18-YEAR-OLD CAN VOTE FOR A STATE LEGISLATIVE CAMPAIGN, CAN DONATE TO A STATE LEGISLATIVE CAMPAIGN, CAN VOLUNTEER FOR A STATE LEGISLATIVE CAMPAIGN, CAN CAMPAIGN MANAGE A STATE LEGISLATIVE CAMPAIGN, BUT ACTUALLY CAN'T PUT THEIR NAME ON THE BALLOT. NOW THAT SEEMS TO BE A KIND OF, TO ME, UNCOMFORTABLE IMBALANCE OF DIFFERENT POLITICAL RIGHTS. SO THE RIGHT TO VOTE, THE RIGHT TO EXPRESS YOUR POLITICAL OPINION IS VERY STRONG, SO STRONG THAT WE DECIDED THAT IF 18-YEAR-OLDS CAN GO TO WAR, THEY CAN VOTE ON WHETHER OR NOT WE HAVE SAID WAR. SO I UNDERSTAND THAT. AND THAT'S WHY WE LOWERED IT. I THINK SENATOR LARSON HAD A VERY GOOD THOUGHT ON THE LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF THIS IN THE SENSE THAT WHEN WE SET 21 AS THE AGE TO RUN FOR THE LEGISLATURE, 21 WAS THE VOTING AGE. AND FOR THE FIRST 40 YEARS OF OUR UNICAMERAL OR SO, YOU COULD RUN FOR LEGISLATURE AS SOON AS YOU COULD VOTE. NOW WE COULD START ARGUING ABOUT THE PRACTICAL MATTER. I WOULD SAY WE ARE PROBABLY NEVER GOING TO FACE A SITUATION IN WHICH A SUPREME COURT JUSTICE IS GOING TO BE 18 UNLESS DOOGIE HOWSER WENT TO LAW SCHOOL INSTEAD OF MEDICAL SCHOOL. MAYBE IN A SITUATION LIKE THAT THERE MIGHT HAVE SOME QUALIFICATIONS THERE. AND JUST TO BACK UP THAT POINT, I WENT BACK AND GOT SOME LEGISLATIVE HISTORY FROM A PREDECESSOR OF MINE. SO IN DISTRICT 26, I WAS 26 WHEN I WAS FIRST ELECTED. MY IMMEDIATE PREDECESSOR, AMANDA MCGILL, WAS 26 WHEN SHE WAS ELECTED. AND TWO PREDECESSORS BEFORE HER WAS SENATOR DON WESELY WHO WAS 24 WHEN HE WAS ELECTED. AND AT THAT TIME HE WAS THE THIRD-YOUNGEST MEMBER EVER ELECTED TO THIS BODY AT THE AGE OF 24. I KNOW...I BELIEVE SENATOR LARSON BEAT HIM BY SEVERAL WEEKS TO BE SLIGHTLY YOUNGER. BUT I WENT BACK AND TALKED WITH HIM JUST NOW AND SAID, HAS ANYBODY EVER BEEN ELECTED AT THE AGE OF 21? HAS ANYBODY EVER BEEN ELECTED AT OUR CURRENT MINIMUM THRESHOLD? AND HE SAID TO HIS KNOWLEDGE, NO. THE YOUNGEST PERSON EVER ELECTED WAS 22. SO IF WE LOWER IT TO 18, MAYBE SOME 18-YEAR-OLDS FILE, BUT IT'S NOT NECESSARILY...AS THEY SHOULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO, BUT IT'S NOT NECESSARILY, LIKE THE ONLY THING THAT'S STOPPING HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS FROM TAKING OVER THE LEGISLATURE IS OUR CONSTITUTION. (LAUGHTER) I THINK THERE'S SEVERAL THINGS THAT MAYBE WOULD PREVENT THEM FROM,

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SAY, INSTITUTING A TIDE OF CHANGE AND SWEEPING US ALL OUT OF OFFICE. SO I JUST WANTED TO RISE AND GIVE THE BODY MY PERSPECTIVE. I WOULD YIELD SENATOR LARSON THE REMAINDER OF MY TIME IF HE COULD USE IT. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR LARSON, YOU ARE YIELDED 1:45. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, AND THANK YOU, SENATOR HANSEN, FOR YOUR SUPPORT. COLLEAGUES, WE HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO PUT RIGHT, ONE, NOT ONLY WHAT GEORGE NORRIS INTENDED AS SENATOR HANSEN AGAIN REITERATED, THAT IF YOU ARE OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE, WE SHOULD NOT DISENFRANCHISE YOU FROM SERVING IN THE NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE. I GOT A TEXT FROM A MEDICAL FRIEND OF MINE... [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: ...THAT SAID IF WE WANT TO USE THE ARGUMENT THAT THE BRAINS AREN'T FULLY DEVELOPED AT THE AGE OF 18 TO VOTE ON THESE ISSUES, THERE'S JUST AS MUCH SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH THAT SAYS THE BRAIN STARTS TO DETERIORATE AT THE AGE OF 65 OR EVEN SOONER IN SOME CASES. (LAUGH) [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHILZ: YOU TALKING ABOUT ME? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: NO, SENATOR SCHILZ, I'M NOT. SO DOES THAT MEAN WE NEED AN UPPER AGE LIMIT? NO, I DON'T THINK SO. BUT THE CONCEPT IS IF YOU'RE GOING TO USE THAT SCIENCE, IT WOULD FOLLOW ALONG. IF THAT'S THE ARGUMENT YOU'RE GOING TO USE, ALL RIGHT, BUT BE READY TO PUT AN UPPER AGE LIMIT ON IT AS WELL. COLLEAGUES,... [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: TIME, SENATOR. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: THANK YOU. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR HANSEN AND SENATOR LARSON. SENATOR EBKE, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SENATOR EBKE: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I STAND IN SUPPORT OF LR26CA. WHETHER OR NOT IT ACTUALLY TURNS INTO A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, I DON'T KNOW. BUT I THINK THE VOTERS OUGHT TO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK ON THIS JUST BECAUSE, AS SENATOR LARSON POINTS OUT, THE ORIGINAL AGE FOR STATE LEGISLATORS WAS 21 BASED ON A 21-YEAR-OLD VOTING AGE. I THINK SENATOR HANSEN IS ABSOLUTELY RIGHT, THAT PRACTICALLY SPEAKING, I THINK IT'S UNLIKELY THAT THE LEGISLATIVE BODY WILL BECOME A LARGE STUDENT COUNCIL. I AGREE WITH THE NOTION THAT PEOPLE WHO ARE OLD ENOUGH TO SERVE IN THE MILITARY OUGHT TO BE OLD ENOUGH TO SERVE IN THE LEGISLATURE. AND BEYOND THAT, I WOULD TRUST THE VOTERS OF NEBRASKA TO DO THE WISE THING WHEN IT COMES TO DECIDING WHETHER OR NOT THIS SHOULD BECOME A PART OF OUR CONSTITUTION. AND WITH THAT, I WOULD YIELD THE REST OF MY TIME TO SENATOR SCHNOOR IF HE WOULD LIKE IT. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR SCHNOOR, YOU'RE YIELDED 4:00. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHNOOR: THANK YOU, SENATOR EBKE. ON A LIGHTER NOTE, I LIKE THE IDEA OF AN AGE RESTRICTION AND I THINK WE SHOULD MAKE IT 77 YEARS OLD. (LAUGHTER) SORRY. NOW SERIOUSLY, I SERVED IN THE MILITARY. I WAS THAT 18-YEAR-OLD. EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLDS IN THE MILITARY ARE NEVER PUT IN A POSITION LIKE THAT. YOU'RE NOT A SUPERVISOR. YOU'RE THE GRUNT. YOU'RE THE PERSON THAT'S TOLD WHAT TO DO. YOU FOLLOW THE ORDERS OF YOUR SUPERIORS. YOU'RE MOLDED AND YOU'RE GROOMED TO BE PUT INTO A SUPERVISORY POSITION. SO I JUST WANTED TO CLARIFY. I UNDERSTAND THE THOUGHT PROCESS AND THE COMMENTS ABOUT YOU'RE OLD ENOUGH TO GO TO WAR, YOU'RE OLD ENOUGH TO PULL THE TRIGGER. THAT IS ALL TRUE, BUT WHEN IT COMES TO A SUPERVISORY TYPE OF POSITION OR IN A POSITION OF AUTHORITY, THAT IS NOT GRANTED RIGHT OFF THE BAT JUST BECAUSE YOU ARE 18. THAT'S SOMETHING THAT YOU'RE GROOMED AND MOLDED FOR. THANK YOU, SIR. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR EBKE AND SENATOR SCHNOOR. THOSE IN THE QUEUE ARE SENATORS MORFELD, SCHILZ, GARRETT, LARSON, BRASCH, AND OTHERS. SENATOR MORFELD, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR MORFELD: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I RISE IN SUPPORT OF LR26CA. AND I THINK THIS IS A GOOD DISCUSSION THAT WE'RE HAVING TODAY. WHEN I WAS GOING DOOR TO DOOR IN MY OWN DISTRICT, A LOT OF PEOPLE ASKED ME

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

ARE YOU OLD ENOUGH TO EVEN RUN FOR OFFICE? AND I SAID, WELL, I MEET ALL THE CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS AND I'M ABOUT EIGHT YEARS OLDER THAN THAT. SO...AND I'M HERE IN FRONT OF YOU RIGHT NOW. AND MOST OF THE TIME PEOPLE RIGHT AFTER HAVING AFTER A 30-SECOND TO ONE-MINUTE CONVERSATION KNEW THAT I WAS PROBABLY SOMEWHAT COMPETENT ANYWAY TO BE ABLE HOLD OFFICE AND IT WAS NEVER AN ISSUE. AND IN FACT, MOST PEOPLE WERE EXCITED THAT SOMEBODY THAT WAS YOUNG WAS INTERESTED IN SERVING IN THE STATE LEGISLATURE. I DON'T REALLY THINK THERE'S MUCH DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AN 18-YEAR-OLD AND A 21-YEAR-OLD. AND I CAN TELL YOU THAT IN MY EXPERIENCE, WHICH, GRANTED, IS ONLY 30 YEARS OF IT, I'VE FOUND THAT AGE IS OFTEN A POOR PROXY FOR WISDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY AND OTHER TRAITS THAT ARE NEEDED TO SERVE IN OFFICE AND MAKE LAWS. I'VE MET WISE OLD MEN AND WOMEN; I'VE MET FOOLISH OLD MEN AND WOMEN. AND I'VE MET EVERYTHING ELSE IN BETWEEN. AND SO I THINK THAT THIS IS SOMETHING WHERE THE VOTERS CAN DECIDE. THEY CAN DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THEY WANT 18-YEAR-OLDS TO EVEN JUST NOT EVEN BE ELECTED TO OFFICE, BUT SIMPLY HAVE THE OPTION OF RUNNING. BECAUSE IN THE END, THEY GET TO DECIDE IF THAT INDIVIDUAL IS COMPETENT AND MATURE ENOUGH TO RUN FOR OFFICE. I THINK THE OTHER ARGUMENT, TOO, THAT SENATOR EBKE BROUGHT UP AND SENATOR SCHNOOR AND A FEW OTHERS, THAT IF YOU ARE OLD ENOUGH TO GO OFF AND SERVE YOUR COUNTRY, DIE FOR YOUR COUNTRY IN THE MILITARY, YOU SHOULD BE OLD ENOUGH TO COME BACK AND BE ABLE TO RUN FOR OFFICE AND REPRESENT PEOPLE IF THEY CHOOSE TO HAVE YOU AS THEIR REPRESENTATIVE. AND FORTUNATELY FOR SENATOR SCHNOOR, I'VE ACTUALLY ORDERED FROM BILL DRAFTING AN AMENDMENT THAT WOULD PUT AN AGE LIMIT ON BEING ABLE TO HOLD OFFICE. BUT IN THE SENSE OF COLLEGIALLY, I MADE IT A LITTLE BIT HIGHER FOR SENATOR WILLIAMS. (LAUGH) [LR26CA]

SENATOR WILLIAMS: THANK YOU. [LR26CA]

SENATOR MORFELD: BUT IN ALL SERIOUSNESS, I THINK THAT THIS IS SOMETHING THAT IS IMPORTANT FOR YOUNG VOTERS WHO ARE TURNING THE AGE OF 18 TO KNOW THAT THEY CANNOT ONLY NOT JUST VOTE AND SERVE THEIR COUNTRY IN THE MILITARY, BUT ALSO BE ABLE TO REPRESENT THE PEOPLE IN THE DISTRICT THAT THEY LIVE IN IF THEY SO CHOOSE. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST PRESIDING

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR MORFELD. THOSE STILL WISHING TO SPEAK: SENATOR SCHILZ, GARRETT, LARSON, BRASCH, AND OTHERS. SENATOR SCHILZ, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHILZ: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE BODY. I AM IN SUPPORT OF LR26CA. I THINK THAT SENATOR MORFELD HAD SOME GOOD COMMENTS THERE. AND I DO THINK WE HAVE TO REMEMBER THAT ANYBODY THAT RUNS FOR OFFICE ACTUALLY HAS TO WIN BEFORE IT MATTERS. AND HAVING BEEN THROUGH CAMPAIGNS AND ELECTIONS, I UNDERSTAND THE RIGORS OF THAT, THE VETTING PROCESS THAT HAPPENS, AND I DO TRUST THAT NOT ONLY ARE THERE CERTAIN FOLKS OUT THERE THAT MAY BE 18, 19, 25, 47, 50, 80 THAT CAN DO THE JOB. AND I TRUST THAT THE VOTERS WILL DISCERN AND MAKE THOSE DECISIONS SO THAT EVERYTHING THE DOOMSDAY SAYERS ARE CLAIMING WILL HAPPEN, I JUST DON'T SEE IT HAPPENING. SO WITH THAT, I HOPE WE CAN GET A YES VOTE ON THIS AND NOT TAKE UP TOO MUCH TIME BUT MOVE ON. AND WITH THAT, I'D YIELD THE REST OF MY TIME TO SENATOR LARSON. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: SENATOR LARSON, 3:00. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. COLLEAGUES, I HEAR THE COMMENT THAT WHEN YOU'RE... YOU KNOW, THE MILITARY ARGUMENT. OH, YOU'RE JUST A GRUNT WORKER. YOU DON'T...AREN'T MAKING THE DECISIONS. WELL, COLLEAGUES, THERE'S ACTUALLY BEEN A NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES ACROSS THE COUNTRY ELECTED AT 18 IN OTHER STATES. I THINK THE YEAR THAT I WAS ELECTED, IN 2010, THERE WAS A LARGE...NOT A LARGE WAVE, A DECENT WAVE OF YOUNG INDIVIDUALS ELECTED MEMBERS OF LEGISLATURES ACROSS THIS COUNTRY. I HAD JUST TURNED 24 AND WAS THE YOUNGEST OF AN UPPER HOUSE, BUT I KNOW THERE WERE TWO GIRLS IN I WANT TO SAY OKLAHOMA OR WEST VIRGINIA THAT WERE 18. I KNOW MINNESOTA HAS HAD A FEW THAT WERE 18 OR 19 AS WELL. IN FACT, I WANT TO SAY THERE'S ONLY EVER BEEN FIVE UNDER THE AGE OF 25 IN THE STATE OF NEBRASKA: FOWLER, WESELY, AND KILGARIN, ALL IN THE '70s; AND THEN ERDMAN AND MYSELF IN 2000 AND 2010. I CAN'T EXPRESS TO YOU ENOUGH AS A YOUNG INDIVIDUAL, AND I'M SURE, YOU KNOW, PEOPLE LIKE SENATOR HANSEN AND SENATOR MURANTE AND FORMER SENATOR MCGILL, MELLO, AND NORDQUIST--MELLO IS STILL PART OF US--CAN EXPLAIN HOW MUCH MORE SCRUTINY AND INTENSIVE QUESTIONING YOU GET WHEN YOU ARE YOUNG. I REPRESENT THE OLDEST DISTRICT ON AVERAGE AGE IN THIS STATE. I HAVE THE FEWEST PEOPLE AGE 18-64 AND THE MOST AGE 65 AND OVER. WHEN I FIRST RAN, I HAD TO ANSWER

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

EVERY QUESTION, HAD TO HAVE A STRONG COMMAND OF THE ISSUES, AND I BELIEVE PROBABLY THEY EXPECTED MORE BECAUSE OF MY AGE THAT I UNDERSTOOD THE ISSUES THAT I WAS GOING TO BE DEALING WITH. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: IT IS NOT EASY HAVING TO GO THROUGH THAT PROCESS. AND I THINK THAT VETTING IS EVEN MORE STRICT THAN FOR ANYONE ELSE. SO THE WORRY THAT WE'D HAVE AN 18-YEAR-OLD GOVERNOR OR AN 18-YEAR-OLD SUPREME COURT JUSTICE--AS I SAID, THEY WOULD HAVE TO GET THEIR LAW DEGREE AT 13 TO PRACTICE FOR THE FIVE YEARS NECESSARY BECAUSE EVERY OTHER QUALIFICATION NEEDS TO BE MET--I THINK ARE RED HERRINGS. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR SCHILZ AND SENATOR LARSON. SENATOR GARRETT, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR GARRETT: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. GOOD MORNING, COLLEAGUES. GOOD MORNING, NEBRASKA. I AM ON THIS COMMITTEE AND I DID...SENATOR LARSON MENTIONED THE COMMENTS I MADE. BACK IN THE VIETNAM WAR WHEN I TURNED 18, WAS REGISTERED FOR THE DRAFT, I COULDN'T VOTE. I COULDN'T DRINK. I COULDN'T DO A LOT OF THINGS, BUT I COULD GO TO VIETNAM AND DIE FOR MY COUNTRY. I MEAN, THAT JUST...TO ME AT THE TIME WAS PATENTLY UNFAIR. IF I CAN DIE FOR MY COUNTRY AND FIGHT FOR MY COUNTRY AND I CAN BE LEFT WITH THE AWESOME RESPONSIBILITY OF MAKING A DECISION WHETHER OR NOT TO PULL A TRIGGER AND KILL ANOTHER HUMAN BEING, IT JUST DIDN'T SEEM LOGICAL OR RATIONAL THAT I SHOULDN'T BE ALLOWED TO VOTE FOR OUR ELECTED OFFICIALS. AND IF I'M OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE, I SHOULD BE ABLE TO...I SHOULD ALSO BE ABLE TO RUN FOR OFFICE. WE HAVE AN ABYSMAL RECORD IN THE UNITED STATES. WE ARE SO BLESSED TO HAVE THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WE'VE GOT. BUT NOT ENOUGH PEOPLE ARE INVOLVED. NOT ENOUGH PEOPLE VOTE. AND ONE OF THE THINGS IN THE GOVERNMENT, MILITARY AND VETERANS AFFAIRS COMMITTEE I DO, IF THERE'S ANYTHING THAT COMES BEFORE US THAT WILL HELP STIMULATE PEOPLE TO GO OUT AND VOTE, I'M ALL FOR IT. AND IF WE ALLOW 18-YEAR-OLDS TO HOLD OFFICE, HEY, I THINK THAT'S GOING TO GET SOME OF THEM FIRED UP. HOW MANY ARE GOING TO GET ELECTED FOR OFFICE? IT'S PROBABLY GOING TO BE PRETTY RARE. BUT NEVERTHELESS, IF IT GETS YOUNG PEOPLE INVOLVED IN THE PROCESS AND GETTING OUT THERE TO VOTE, THEN I'M ALL FOR IT. AGE IS

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

NOT...MATURITY IS NOT A CHRONOLOGICAL THING. I MEAN, I HAZARD TO GUESS THERE'S SOME PAGES IN HERE THAT ARE MORE MATURE THAN SOME OF US. I KNOW, MYSELF, I DO SOME PRETTY IMMATURE THINGS SOMETIMES. AND WE WANT TO TALK ABOUT MATURITY, I'LL TALK ABOUT MATURITY. WE HAVE A PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE THAT SAYS AND DOES SOME INCREDIBLY IMMATURE THINGS ON A DAILY BASIS, THAT I CAN TELL YOU. AND WITH WHAT, I'D LIKE TO YIELD THE REST OF MY TIME TO SENATOR BLOOMFIELD. [LB26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: SENATOR BLOOMFIELD, YOU'RE YIELDED 2:40. [LB26CA]

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. THANK YOU, SENATOR GARRETT. WE'RE FLYING UNDER A COUPLE OF FALSE FLAGS HERE. IF YOU'RE OLD ENOUGH TO FIGHT, YOU'RE OLD ENOUGH TO HOLD OFFICE. COLLEAGUES, IF YOU JOIN THE ARMY AT 18 AND SERVE THREE YEARS, HOW OLD ARE YOU WHEN YOU GET OUT? THE MATH ISN'T THAT TOUGH. THE NEXT ONE DOWN AND ONE WE SHOULD LOOK AT PRETTY CLOSE, BECAUSE THERE MAY BE ANOTHER CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT HAVE TO BE DONE. IF YOU'RE OLD ENOUGH TO FIGHT, YOU'RE OLD ENOUGH TO DRINK. SAME STORY. SAME FIGHT WE HAD IN VIETNAM...WHEN WE GOT BACK FROM VIETNAM. DO WE NEED TO LOWER THE DRINKING AGE BACK DOWN TO 18? I'M SURE THERE ARE PEOPLE IN HERE THAT WOULD LIKE TO SEE THAT HAPPEN, BUT COMMON SENSE NEEDS TO PREVAIL. WE TRIED THAT, IT DIDN'T WORK. COLLEAGUES, THIS IS NOT ABOUT BEING 18 AND SERVING IN THE LEGISLATURE. AS I SAID BEFORE, I WOULDN'T OPPOSE THAT BILL. BUT SERVING ON THE SUPREME COURT OR YOU'RE GOING TO JUDGE OVER ANYONE ELSE WHEN YOU'RE 18? YOU'RE GOING TO BE ASKED TO MAKE DECISIONS ON THE LAW WHEN YOU'RE 18. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: AND WHO CAN APPOINT THAT INDIVIDUAL? COLLEAGUES, YOU KNOW WHERE THE APPOINTMENTS COME FROM. I DON'T BELIEVE WE'D HAVE TO WORRY ABOUT IT WITH GOVERNOR RICKETTS. GOVERNOR LARSON, PERHAPS. THIS IS NOT AN ANTI-AGE THING. REALLY, I WOULDN'T MIND IF WE PUT THE UPPER AGE LIMIT AT 70. I'D BE OUT ICE FISHING SOMEWHERE RIGHT NOW. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR BLOOMFIELD AND SENATOR GARRETT. SENATOR LARSON, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SENATOR LARSON: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. COLLEAGUES, I APPRECIATE THE OVERWHELMING SUPPORT AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE ISSUE OF NOT ONLY UNDERSTANDING THAT IF YOU'RE OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE AND DECIDE, YOU SHOULD BE OLD ENOUGH TO REPRESENT. IT IS PURELY A FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT. I'VE ALWAYS SAID THAT I DISAGREE WITH TERM LIMITS ON THE SAME MERIT. WHY SHOULD THE STATE TELL ME THAT ANYBODY IN MY DISTRICT CAN REPRESENT ME BUT ME? BUT THAT'S IN THE CONSTITUTION AND, THEREFORE, WE CAN LEAVE THAT. BUT COLLEAGUES, IF YOU ARE OLD ENOUGH TO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO DECIDE...AND AS SENATOR HANSEN SAID, IF YOU'RE OLD ENOUGH TO KNOCK ON THE DOORS, DONATE TO THE CAMPAIGN, GO OUT AND VOTE FOR THE CANDIDATE, SHOULDN'T YOU BE OLD ENOUGH TO BE THE CANDIDATE? TO DO THIS WILL TAKE AN EXCEPTIONAL INDIVIDUAL. THE 18-YEAR-OLD GOVERNOR, SUPREME COURT JUSTICE, SCARE TACTICS TO TRY TO GET YOU TO VOTE AGAINST LR26CA. IMAGINE WHAT IT WOULD TAKE FOR SOMETHING LIKE THAT TO HAPPEN, THAT 18-YEAR-OLD GOVERNOR. YOU'RE LOOKING AT GOVERNOR'S RACES THAT COST \$7 MILLION, \$8 MILLION AT LEAST TO WIN A GOVERNOR'S RACE, SOMETIMES \$10 MILLION OR \$12 MILLION. YOU KNOW WHAT THAT 18-YEAR-OLD IS GOING TO HAVE TO DO TO RAISE \$10 MILLION, NOT ONLY TO GET NAME ID OUT, BUT THEN PROVE TO THE CITIZENS OF NEBRASKA THAT THEY ARE THE BEST OPTION, WIN A REPUBLICAN OR DEMOCRAT PRIMARY, AND MOVE FORWARD? THE LIKELIHOOD OF THAT HAPPENING IS SO MINUSCULE THAT IF IT DID, THAT INDIVIDUAL WOULD HAVE TO BE SO EXCEPTIONAL TO RAISE THAT AMOUNT OF MONEY AND BE ABLE TO HAVE THAT COMMAND OF THE ISSUES THAT, FRANKLY, THEY MIGHT DESERVE TO BE GOVERNOR. LET'S USE OUR COMMON SENSE. EVEN IN THE LEGISLATURE YOU'RE LOOKING AT \$100,000 TO WIN ONE OF THESE RACES. THAT 18-YEAR-OLD IS GOING TO HAVE TO GO OUT AND RAISE THAT MONEY, KNOCK ON DOORS, CONVINC...IN MY DISTRICT, YOU NEED ABOUT 10,000 VOTES TO WIN A RACE. TEN THOUSAND PEOPLE YOU'VE GOT TO GO OUT AND CONVINC THAT YOU ARE THE BEST CANDIDATE. YOU KNOW, WHEN YOU SAY THAT YOU DON'T THINK THAT THE PEOPLE SHOULD EVEN HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO VOTE FOR THESE PEOPLE, YOU'RE SHOWING YOUR LACK OF FAITH IN THE NEBRASKA VOTERS. YOU ARE SHOWING YOUR LACK OF FAITH THAT THEY CAN UNDERSTAND THE ISSUES AND UNDERSTAND THE CANDIDATES ENOUGH TO VOTE WHO THEY THINK IS BEST. AS I SAID IN ONE OF MY FIRST STATEMENTS, I TRUST THE NEBRASKA VOTERS AND THE PEOPLE OF NEBRASKA TO ELECT WHO THEY THINK IS BEST TO REPRESENT THEM. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SENATOR LARSON: AND BY SAYING NO TO LR26CA YOU ARE SAYING, I DON'T TRUST YOU; AND I DON'T TRUST YOU SO MUCH THAT I DON'T THINK YOU SHOULD EVEN HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ELECT THESE INDIVIDUALS. THAT'S UNFORTUNATE THAT WE EVEN HAVE THAT MENTALITY. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR LARSON. SENATOR BRASCH, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR BRASCH: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, AND GOOD MORNING, COLLEAGUES. I FIND IT VERY INTERESTING THAT OUR GOOD FRIEND AND COLLEAGUE, SENATOR LARSON, IS PUTTING WORDS IN OUR MOUTH ABOUT TRUST, ABOUT CONFIDENCE, WHAT WE'RE SAYING. I FIND THAT RATHER REACHING VERY, VERY FAR ON THIS DEBATE. NOT PUTTING WORDS IN ANYONE'S MOUTH. WE'RE HERE TO REPRESENT OUR DISTRICTS. AND I LOOKED AT...I THOUGHT, OKAY, YOU KNOW, I GET A TEXT MESSAGE LAST NIGHT ON MY POSITION ON THIS FROM SENATOR LARSON. I DID NOT HAVE MY PHONE ON TO READ IT, THOUGHT I'LL GIVE HIM A FAIR SHAKE TODAY. BUT LISTENING HOW HIS CONVERSATION IS SLOWLY SINKING INTO BLASTING SENATOR BLOOMFIELD...THANK YOU FOR SERVING OUR COUNTRY, SENATOR BLOOMFIELD AND OTHERS IN HERE, FOR STANDING UP AND SAYING THE WORDS THAT WE HAVE THAT OUR REPRESENTATIVES WANT TO SEE. TRYING TO GIVE HIM A FAIR SHAKE. I LOOK AT THE COMMITTEE STATEMENT. I DIDN'T SEE A SINGLE PERSON COME TESTIFY. IS THAT CORRECT, SENATOR LARSON? WOULD YOU YIELD TO A QUESTION? [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: SENATOR LARSON, WILL YOU YIELD? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: YES. [LR26CA]

SENATOR BRASCH: OKAY. DID YOU HAVE ANY PROPONENTS? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: I DON'T THINK THERE WERE ANY PROPONENTS, OPPONENTS, OR NEUTRAL TESTIMONY IN THE BILL. [LR26CA]

SENATOR BRASCH: VERY GOOD. THANK YOU. I HAVE NO OTHER QUESTIONS. TRYING TO BE FAIR, I TURNED AROUND TO MY OTHER GOOD COLLEAGUE, SENATOR KOLOWSKI, WHO IS A SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR. AND I SAID, IN YOUR

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SCHOOLS HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE 18 AND STILL IN SCHOOL? HIS ANSWER WAS, THE MAJORITY. AND I FIND THAT TRUE. THE MAJORITY, THAT'S PROBABLY WHY THERE ARE NO 18-YEAR-OLDS--THEY'RE STILL IN CLASS--THAT COULD COME TESTIFY TO THIS. AND I'M NOT SURE AN 18-YEAR-OLD WOULD UNDERSTAND THE SCOPE AND THE HEAVY LIFTING THAT TAKES PLACE WHEN YOU ARE IN A PUBLIC OFFICE. AND WHEN YOU'RE GOING DOOR TO DOOR, THAT YOU UNDERSTAND THAT SOMEONE BEHIND THAT DOOR MAY HAVE A WHOLE DIFFERENT LIFE, A WHOLE DIFFERENT EXPERIENCE. AND OUR 18-YEAR-OLDS HAVE BEEN PHENOMENAL IN OUR DISTRICT. I'VE GONE TO SOME EAGLE SCOUT MEETINGS. I'VE GONE TO DIFFERENT EVENTS. I BELIEVE THAT WE ARE GOING TO BE IN GOOD HANDS. HOWEVER, I ALSO WISH SOME LIFE FOR THEM AFTER THEY LEAVE THAT SCHOOL, SOME EXPERIENCES THAT MAKE THE STRONG EVEN STRONGER. THAT ALONG THE WAY THAT THEY FIND THAT THEIR JOYS, THEIR SORROWS, THEIR CHALLENGES, THEIR OPPORTUNITIES, ARE ALL A PART OF WHO THEY ARE GOING TO BECOME FIVE YEARS DOWN THE ROAD, TEN YEARS. WE ALL HAVE GAINED THAT LIFE EXPERIENCE. AND LISTENING TO THOSE WHO HAVE SERVED HERE...AND SENATOR SCHNOOR, HE ANSWERED A QUESTION OF MINE BECAUSE I THOUGHT, GOODNESS, ARE WE PUTTING OUR 18-YEAR-OLDS, WHO SOMETIMES ARE JUST MERELY BOYS AND GIRLS, OUT ON THE FIELD? AND HE SAID THAT THERE'S A LOT THAT GOES INTO THIS YOUNG MAN AND WOMAN BEFORE THEY'RE PREPARED TO LEAD. AND I THINK THAT'S TRUE OF ANY OF MY COLLEAGUES HERE. THERE'S A LOT THAT YOU HAVE LEARNED. AND YOUR CONSTITUENTS HAVE LEARNED FROM YOU AND THEY HAVE, ON THAT DECISION, DECIDED TO PUT YOU HERE TO REPRESENT THEM AND THEIR THOUGHTS. AND TO PUT AN 18-YEAR-OLD IN A POSITION TO GO INTO ELECTED OFFICE WHERE THEY HAVEN'T HAD AN OPPORTUNITY YET TO LEAVE THEIR HOME PERHAPS. THEY HAVEN'T EVEN HAD THEIR FIRST APARTMENT, YOU KNOW. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR BRASCH: IT SEEMS AN INTERESTING CONCEPT. WE HAVE GREAT 18-YEAR-OLDS, BUT I'D LIKE THEM TO BE MORE EXPERIENCED, HAVE MORE OPPORTUNITIES TO LEARN WHY YOU SERVE BEFORE YOU LEAVE SCHOOL AND GO TO SERVING. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. AND THANK YOU, COLLEAGUES. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR BRASCH. SENATOR MURANTE, YOU ARE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SENATOR MURANTE: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. MEMBERS, GOOD MORNING. I RISE IN OPPOSITION TO THE BRACKET MOTION AND IN SUPPORT OF LR26CA. A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS THAT WERE BROUGHT UP THAT I HOPE I CAN ANSWER TO SOME EXTENT. THE FIRST DEALS WITH THE COST. WHAT DOES IT COST TO PUT A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON THE BALLOT? AND THE SIMPLE ANSWER IS, AS LONG AS PUTTING SOMETHING ON THE BALLOT DOES NOT REQUIRE THE PRINTING OF A NEW BALLOT PAGE, THE COST WILL BE DE MINIMIS. IT WOULDN'T COST ANYTHING TO...CERTAINLY IT WILL COST NOTHING TO THE STATE. IT IS NOT A STATE EXPENSE, BUT THE COUNTIES WOULD HAVE POTENTIALLY A DE MINIMIS COST. BUT CONSIDERING WE ALREADY KNOW THAT WE HAVE A BALLOT INITIATIVE WITH RESPECT TO THE DEATH PENALTY AND THEN THREE MORE GAMBLING INITIATIVES WHICH POTENTIALLY COULD GET PUT ON THE BALLOT, IT'S PRETTY CLEAR THAT THAT PAGE IS GOING TO BE PRINTED ANYWAY AND THIS WILL HAVE NO ADDITIONAL COST TO THE COUNTY. IT WAS RAISED, WHY DON'T WE JUST HANDLE THIS? WHY ARE WE THROWING THIS TO THE PEOPLE? WE'RE A LEGISLATURE. IF WE'RE GOING TO JUST PASS EVERYTHING ON TO THE PEOPLE, WHY DON'T WE JUST ADJOURN EARLY? THE SIMPLE ANSWER IS AGE REQUIREMENTS FOR NUMEROUS PUBLIC OFFICES IN THE STATE OF NEBRASKA ARE LOCATED IN THE CONSTITUTION AND WE CANNOT AMEND THE CONSTITUTION WITHOUT SUBMITTING A BALLOT QUESTION TO THE PEOPLE. SO WE DON'T HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO SIMPLY ANSWER THIS QUESTION FOR OURSELVES. WE HAVE TO GO TO THE PEOPLE AND ASK THEIR PERMISSION TO DO IT. SO IF WE THINK THIS IS A GOOD IDEA--AND I CERTAINLY THINK THAT IT IS-- WE ARE REQUIRED TO GO TO THE PEOPLE. THERE IS SIMPLY NOTHING SENATOR LARSON CAN DO TO HANDLE THIS ISSUE WITHIN THE LEGISLATURE WITHOUT SUBMITTING IT TO THE PEOPLE. AND I DON'T BELIEVE AT THIS POINT THIS LEGISLATURE HAS SUBMITTED ANY BALLOT QUESTIONS TO THE PEOPLE OF NEBRASKA, SO I DON'T THINK WE HAVE A RECORD OF DELEGATING OUR LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY BY ANY MEASURE. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THE QUESTION BEFORE US IS ONE QUESTION: SHOULD PEOPLE WHO WANT TO RUN FOR PUBLIC OFFICE IN THE STATE OF NEBRASKA BE 18? AND I THINK IT'S IMPORTANT TO REITERATE THAT THERE ARE JOB DESCRIPTION REQUIREMENTS AND DUTIES FOR ELECTIVE OFFICE IN THE STATE OF NEBRASKA. THOSE JOB REQUIREMENTS ARE NOT NULLIFIED BY LR26CA. SOMEONE WOULD STILL HAVE TO MEET EVERY OTHER REQUIREMENT TO HOLD THAT PUBLIC OFFICE. THE AGE REQUIREMENT WOULD BE 18. SO WE AREN'T DOING AWAY WITH THE REST OF THE REQUIREMENTS. WE'RE NOT LOWERING THE BAR FOR WHAT IT TAKES TO HOLD PUBLIC OFFICE IN THE STATE OF NEBRASKA. ALL WE'RE TALKING ABOUT IS AGE. AND IT'S BEEN POINTED OUT TIME AND TIME AGAIN, AGE IS A POOR DETERMINING FACTOR WHEN WE'RE TALKING ABOUT INTELLIGENCE AND

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

CAPABILITY. THERE ARE SMART 18-YEAR-OLDS. THERE ARE SMART ELDERLY CITIZENS ON THE OTHER SIDE, TOO. THAT'S JUST THE WAY THAT IT IS. SO I ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT LR26CA AND VOTE NO ON THE BRACKET MOTION. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR MURANTE. THOSE STILL WISHING TO SPEAK: SENATOR CHAMBERS, GROENE, KOLOWSKI, AND FRIESEN. SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. FIRST OF ALL, I WOULD ADDRESS WHAT SENATOR SCHNOOR SAID ABOUT MAKING THE BEGINNING LIMIT 77. BUT I TOLD HIM, THEY WOULD HAVE TO PUT A PROVISION THAT SAYS, ANYBODY 77 AT THE TIME WOULD BE GRANDFATHERED IN, SO I'LL BE OKAY TO MAKE IT. BUT HERE'S WHAT I LOOK AT. IN ORDER TO HAVE AN ORDERLY SOCIETY, YOU HAVE TO SOMETIMES MAKE ARBITRARY GUIDELINES. SO AT THE AGE OF 21, BECAUSE YOU DON'T WANT AN ASSEMBLY OF ONLY OLDER PEOPLE, YOU'RE NOT PRESUMING THAT SOMEBODY 21 IS A LOT SMARTER THAN SOMEBODY 18. BUT YOU CAN MAKE A PRESUMPTION THAT SOMEBODY AT THE AGE OF 21, ALTHOUGH NOT COMPLETELY SEASONED AND EXPERIENCED, WOULD BE IN A POSITION TO START DOING THE WORK THAT GOES ALONG WITH BEING IN THAT OFFICE IF HE OR SHE CAN OBTAIN ELECTION. EIGHTEEN, IN MY MIND, IS TOO YOUNG. I WILL SUPPORT THE BRACKET MOTION. I WILL OPPOSE THIS. AND I WOULDN'T WANT ANYBODY TO GET THE IDEA THAT I WAS SO LACKING IN UNDERSTANDING AND MATURITY MYSELF THAT SOMETHING THAT HAS A LOT OF ALLURE IS SOMETHING THAT OUGHT TO BE PUT INTO THE CONSTITUTION. AND I DON'T THINK THE PUBLIC WOULD ACCEPT IT ANYWAY. BUT HERE'S SOMETHING THAT SENATOR GARRETT MADE ME THINK OF: A LADY NAMED BEATRIX POTTER WROTE THE PETER RABBIT STORY AND THEY FOUND OUT RECENTLY THAT THERE'S ANOTHER STORY SHE WROTE CALLED KITTY-IN-BOOTS AND IT'S GOING TO BE PUBLISHED TO COINCIDE WITH HER 150TH BIRTHDAY WERE SHE STILL ALIVE, AND PEOPLE CAN'T WAIT FOR IT. AND THAT MADE ME THINK OF SOMETHING WHEN SENATOR GARRETT MENTIONED THIS IRRESPONSIBLE PERSON WHO'S RUNNING FOR PRESIDENT. I WAS THINKING OF WRITING A VERSION OF THE THREE LITTLE PIGS WITH DONALD TRUMP. AND DONALD TRUMP WOULD SAY, I AM THE BIG, BAD WOLF. AND THE FIRST LITTLE PIG WOULD BE SENATOR CRUZ. SENATOR CRUZ HAS A HOUSE MADE OF STICKS. SO DONALD TRUMP WOULD GO OVER THERE WITH HIS HOT AIR AND BAD BREATH. HE HUFFED AND HE PUFFED AND HE BLEW THE HOUSE DOWN AND CRUZ TOOK OFF LIKE A ROCKET. THE NEXT ONE WOULD BE MARCO RUBIO, SECOND LITTLE PIG. HE'S NOT SMART, SO HE BUILT HIS HOUSE OF STRAW. SO THE

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

WOLF WENT AGAIN WITH HIS HOT AIR AND BAD BREATH AND HUFFED AND PUFFED AND BLEW THE STRAW AWAY AND OFF WENT RUBIO. AND SINCE HE'S NOT MUCH YOUNGER THAN THAT OTHER GUY, HE ALMOST CAUGHT HIM AND OVERTOOK HIM. THEN THE THIRD WAS THIS POOR, LITTLE GUY CALLED BEN CARSON WHO DIDN'T HAVE A HOUSE, BUT HE HAD A LITTLE CAMPFIRE OUT IN THE BACKYARD OF SOMEBODY'S HOUSE. SO DONALD TRUMP SAW THIS IS EASY. AND HE COULDN'T MAKE UP HIS MIND WHETHER TO JUST STEP ON IT WITH A PAW OR HUFF AND PUFF, BUT HE DECIDED THAT IN THE INTEREST OF BEING FAIR HE'D DO THE SAME TO HIM. SO HE HUFFED AND HE PUFFED AND HE BLEW THE HOUSE DOWN. THEN THEY SAID, DONALD, THERE'S A LADY NAMED MEGYN KELLY. WHAT YOU GOING TO DO ABOUT HER? HE SAID, MEGYN KELLY? HE SAID, NO, I'M NOT GOING TO MESS WITH HER. THEY SAID, WELL, YOU WENT AFTER THOSE THREE OTHER GUYS. HE SAID, ONE'S HOUSE WAS MADE OF STRAW, THE OTHER WAS MADE OF STICKS, AND THE OTHER WAS MADE OF...JUST HAD A CAMPFIRE. BUT MEGYN KELLY, HERE'S WHAT I THINK ABOUT HER: SHE'S A BRICK HOUSE. SHE'S MIGHTY, MIGHTY, LETTING IT ALL HANG OUT. SO DONALD TRUMP TOOK OFF AND INSTEAD OF HOWLING LIKE HE DID WITH THE OTHERS HE WAS YIPPING LIKE A LITTLE BABY PUPPY DOG. HE IS A BULLY, BUT IF HIS PEOPLE, AS HE CALLS THEM, LIKE HIM, IT'S UP TO THEM TO DECIDE WHAT THEY'LL DO WITH HIM. HE'S AFRAID OF THAT WOMAN BECAUSE HE CAN INTIMIDATE ALL THE OTHERS RUNNING AGAINST HIM, BUT THE WOMAN WOULD ASK HIM THE KIND OF QUESTIONS THAT OUGHT TO BE ASKED AND HE CANNOT ANSWER THEM. HE'S ACCUSTOMED TO HAVING HIS WAY. IF HE'S ASKED A TOUGH QUESTION BY A MALE, HE JUST SAYS, NO POINT, DOESN'T MEAN A THING, AND IT'S OVER. BUT SHE WOULD NOT LET HIM GET AWAY AND HE'S INTIMIDATED BY HER... [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...AND I'M GLAD SHE EXPOSED HIM FOR WHAT HE IS. HE'S GOING TO STAND UP TO NORTH KOREA (ROAR). HE'S GOING TO STAND UP TO RUSSIA (ROAR). HE'S GOING TO STAND UP TO CHINA (ROAR). MEGYN KELLY, (YIP YIP YIP YIP YIP YIP YIP) AND AWAY HE GOES. THAT'S WHO'S GOING TO BE YOUR NEXT PRESIDENT. I CAN'T WAIT. PUTIN CAN'T WAIT. NOBODY CAN WAIT FOR IT. THIS WILL BE THE SHOW OF SHOWS. AND I HOPE I'M STILL IN THE LEGISLATURE AND I WILL RIDE YOU ALL LIKE A BRONC RIDER RIDES A WILD HORSE. YOU WOULDN'T BE ABLE TO GET ME OFF YOUR BACK BECAUSE I'LL BE STUCK TO YOU TIGHTER THAN IT WOULD BE THE CASE IF IT WAS CRAZY GLUE. AND I USE THE TERM ADVISABLY, BECAUSE THE PERSON I'LL BE RIDING YOU ABOUT DOES FIT THAT DESCRIPTION. SUPPOSE I SAID, I CAN STAND IN THE MIDDLE OF DODGE

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

STREET AND SHOOT A COP AND PEOPLE IN MY DISTRICT WOULD STILL VOTE FOR ME. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: TIME, SENATOR. THANK YOU, SENATOR CHAMBERS. SENATOR GROENE, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LB26CA]

SENATOR GROENE: MR. PRESIDENT, I'M ON THE GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE. I VOTED IT OUT OF COMMITTEE FOR ONE REASON, ONE REASON ONLY. I BELIEVE THE FOLKS SHOULD HAVE A RIGHT TO VOTE ON ISSUES. I WISH I COULD SAY THAT CONCERNED THEM. WE HAD NO ONE TESTIFY FOR OR AGAINST IT. NOT EVEN ONE 18-YEAR-OLD SHOWED UP TO TESTIFY FOR IT. I WILL NOT VOTE FOR IT WHEN I'M IN THE BALLOT...VOTING IN THE BALLOT BOX. IT'S FOOLISHNESS, BUT PEOPLE HAVE A RIGHT. I'M A BIG, FIRM BELIEVER IN PEOPLE VOTING FOR THINGS. I WOULD PREFER THAT THE 18-YEAR-OLDS OF NEBRASKA ROSE UP IN ANGER AND WENT OUT WITH PETITIONS AND SAID WE WANT TO RUN FOR OFFICE, FOR GOVERNOR, AND GOT 120,000 SIGNATURES AND PUT IT ON THE BALLOT. I DOUBT MOST 18-YEAR-OLDS...I DON'T KNOW IF THERE'S ONE...SOME OF THESE FOLKS HERE MIGHT BE 18, THEY FINALLY HEARD ABOUT IT. I DON'T THINK THEY'RE PUSHING FOR IT. SOLDIERS 18 YEARS OLD? YES, THERE ARE SOLDIERS 18 YEARS OLD, BUT THERE ARE NOT 18-YEAR-OLD CAPTAINS OR SERGEANTS OR LIEUTENANTS. IF I WAS 18 YEARS OLD, I WOULD NOT WANT AN 18-YEAR-OLD SENDING ME INTO BATTLE. BUT THAT'S BASICALLY A COMPARISON OF BEING 18-YEAR-OLDS AND VOTING AND BEING 18 YEARS OLD AND BE IN A POSITION OF POWER IN GOVERNMENT. TWELVE THOUSAND DOLLAR WAGE. WE MIGHT GET SOME 18-YEAR-OLDS, BECAUSE...WELL, I DON'T KNOW. TIPS IN LINCOLN ARE PRETTY HIGH AT THE RESTAURANTS. THEY'D HAVE TO GIVE UP THEIR HIGH PAY AS A WAITER AND TAKE A JOB FOR \$12,000. SO ONE DAY IT MIGHT HAPPEN. WE HAVE SOME 18-YEAR-OLDS, 19-YEAR-OLDS AND THEN SOME 77-YEAR-OLDS WITH A LOT OF MONEY AS OUR SENATORS. IT COULD HAPPEN. MY LEGISLATIVE AIDE FOUND OUT...WE GOT SOME PROBLEMS IF WE GET AN 18-YEAR-OLD HERE. ACCORDING TO STATUTE 43-2001 (SIC--43-2101), PERSONS UNDER 19 YEARS OF AGE ARE DECLARED MINORS. IF WE HAVE AN 18-YEAR-OLD HERE AND THEY TRIP OFF ONE OF THESE STEPS, WE WOULD HAVE TO GET THEIR MOTHER'S PERMISSION TO TAKE THEM TO WHICH DOCTOR BECAUSE THEY HAVE NOT REACHED THE AGE OF MAJORITY. THANKS TO SENATOR CHAMBERS, WE CANNOT BE ARRESTED DURING SESSION, SO I GUESS THE 18-YEAR-OLDS CAN GO TO THE LOBBY PARTIES AND DRINK AS MUCH AS THEY WANT. OR CAN THEY EVEN GO TO THE PARTY? WELL, THEY CAN. WHILE YOU'RE IN SESSION, YOU CANNOT BE ARRESTED. I MEAN, THAT'S JUST THE FOOLISHNESS OF IT. NOW, ONE OF THE REASONS I VOTED OUT OF COMMITTEE, I'D LIKE TO SEE A LITMUS TEST,

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

BECAUSE ONCE IN A WHILE I SEE A LITMUS TEST HOW FAR OUR SOCIETY HAS FALLEN, HOW FAR WE HAVE DECIDED THAT NOTHING MATTERS. EXPERIENCE DOESN'T MEAN ANYTHING. WE'RE JUST TAKING ELECTED OFFICE AS A JOKE. AND I HAPPEN TO BE ON SENATOR CHAMBERS' SIDE. IF WE ELECT TRUMP, I GIVE UP. I GIVE UP. AND IF WE START ELECTING 18-YEAR-OLDS TO MAJOR POSITIONS OF POWER. I GIVE UP. I'M GOING TO THE HILLS. YOU WON'T SEE ME HERE EITHER. BUT I AGREE THAT THE PEOPLE SHOULD VOTE. IT'S GOING TO BE A GOOD LITMUS TEST TO SEE WHERE WE'RE AT IN NEBRASKA IN COMMON SENSE. SO THANK YOU. I'M GOING TO VOTE FOR THE BILL, BECAUSE LIKE I SAID, I WANT TO SEE WHAT HAPPENS. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR GROENE, FOR PUTTING THAT ON THE RECORD. SENATOR KOLOWSKI, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KOLOWSKI: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I STAND IN SUPPORT OF THIS BILL AND SIMPLY WANT TO STATE THE EXPERIENCES I'VE HAD AS A HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL WITH SO MANY OUTSTANDING STUDENTS OVER THE YEARS. CERTAINLY THEIR PROBLEM-SOLVING, DECISION-MAKING SKILLS AND LIFE EXPERIENCES MIGHT HAVE BEEN ON THE LOW SIDE, BUT THEIR ABILITIES WERE CERTAINLY ON THE HIGH SIDE. WHAT THEY WILL CONTRIBUTE TO A DISCUSSION AND SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEMS AND ISSUES WOULD BE EXCELLENT. AT ONE TIME A VERY SHORT TIME AGO, MILLARD WEST HIGH SCHOOL HAD THE STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE AND STUDENT PRESIDENT ON THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE MED CENTER, OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN, AND THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-OMAHA ALL IN THE SAME YEAR. I'M VERY PROUD OF THOSE KIND OF STUDENTS AND THE CAPACITIES THEY HAVE AND WHAT THEY DO AS FAR AS SPEAKING THEIR MINDS, MAKING DECISIONS ON A BIGGER PICTURE FOR THE ISSUES OF OUR STATE AND THEIR SCHOOLS, AND CONTRIBUTING IN A MIGHTY WAY TO THE PROGRESS OF NEBRASKA. IN THE SAME WAY, THERE ARE OTHER STUDENTS THAT DON'T HAVE THOSE CAPABILITIES. AND I WOULD SAY THE SAME THING ABOUT ADULTS. THERE ARE THOSE WHO ARE STRONGER AND THOSE WHO ARE WEAKER AS FAR AS DECISION-MAKING, PROBLEM-SOLVING SKILLS. SO WE...IT'S NOT SO MUCH AN AGE ISSUE WITH ME. IT'S A CAPACITY AND QUALIFICATIONS ISSUE TO DO THE THINGS WE NEED TO DO IN PROBLEM SOLVING, DECISION MAKING TO MOVE OUR STATE FORWARD. THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR KOLOWSKI. SENATOR FRIESEN, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SENATOR FRIESEN: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I'VE BEEN WAFFLING ON THIS BILL. I DON'T KNOW QUITE WHICH WAY TO GO. I MET SEVERAL YOUNG PEOPLE WHO ARE VERY CAPABLE. BUT WHEN I LOOK AT THE POSITIONS THAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT HERE AND THE RESPONSIBILITIES THAT THEY ARE, I LOOK AT PEOPLE AND WHEN I LOOK AT THIS BODY I WANT PEOPLE IN HERE WHO HAVE LIFE EXPERIENCES, AND THAT INCLUDES: HAVING A JOB, RAISING A FAMILY OR AT LEAST GETTING READY TO RAISE A FAMILY, AND THINKING OF THOSE RESPONSIBILITIES THAT WE WILL GO THROUGH THE REST OF OUR LIFE. AND SO THOSE LIFE EXPERIENCES TO ME IS WHAT GIVES MOST OF US THE WISDOM HERE TO MAKE DECISIONS ON THINGS THAT WE'RE NOT COMFORTABLE WITH. THERE'S A LOT OF THINGS BEING A FARMER THAT I DON'T HAVE TO DEAL WITH ON THE FARM. AND THE URBAN ISSUES, I DON'T HAVE TO DEAL WITH THEM. BUT MY LIFE EXPERIENCES THAT I'VE HAD LEADING UP TO THIS HELPED ME WITH THOSE DECISIONS. AND IT WOULD CONCERN ME A LITTLE BIT WHEN YOU START TO GET 18-YEAR-OLDS AND 19-YEAR-OLDS WHO HAVE NOT EXPERIENCED THOSE LIFE EXPERIENCES THAT THEY'RE GOING TO BE MAKING DECISIONS THAT IMPACT US FOR A LONG TIME TO COME. AND I...IF I LOOK BACK AT MY GENERATION, I THINK THAT I WOULD ALMOST...I WOULD BE CONVINCED TO SAY THAT EACH GENERATION, I THINK, OF KIDS THAT ARE COMING OUT OF HIGH SCHOOLS ARE MORE CAPABLE THAN THE NEXT. IT'S NOT AS THOUGH WE ARE DECLINING IN OUR ABILITIES. I'M NOT GOING TO ARGUE THAT AT ALL. I THINK WHEN I LOOKED AT MY KIDS THEY STUDIED HARDER, THEY WORKED HARDER, THEY WERE SMARTER COMING OUT OF HIGH SCHOOL BY FAR THAN I WAS. I WAS VERY IRRESPONSIBLE. BUT THAT DOESN'T MEAN THEY HAD THE LIFE EXPERIENCES YET TO MAKE DECISIONS OF THE MAGNITUDE THAT WE MAKE HERE. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR FRIESEN. SENATOR LARSON, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I'D URGE PEOPLE TO VOTE RED ON THE BRACKET MOTION. LIKE I SAID, I'VE HAD A LOT OF GOOD CONVERSATIONS WITH MANY OF YOU, AND I APPRECIATE THE AMOUNT OF SUPPORT THAT I'VE RECEIVED AND UNDERSTANDING OF THE ISSUE. I CAN UNDERSTAND...YOU KNOW, WE ALWAYS HEAR THE CONCEPT OF YOU NEED LIFE EXPERIENCES OR WHATEVER ELSE. BUT, AGAIN, COLLEAGUES, THIS COMES DOWN TO LETTING THE VOTERS DECIDE WHO THEY FEEL AT THAT POINT IS BEST EQUIPPED TO REPRESENT THEM. THERE'S NO PREREQUISITE FOR FAMILY OR LIFE EXPERIENCES. NOW I HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE A SON THAT'S GOING TO BE FOUR IN FEBRUARY AND BE SINGLE AND TAKE CARE OF HIM AND GO TO

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

HOME TO HIM EVERY NIGHT, AND THAT IS A LIFE EXPERIENCE. AND IT MAY CHANGE ME IN CERTAIN WAYS OR OTHER EXPERIENCES THAT YOU HAVE CAN CHANGE YOU, BUT THAT DOESN'T TAKE AWAY WHAT CAN BE DONE HERE. THOSE EXPERIENCES CAN OFFER GUIDEPOSTS, BUT IT DOESN'T CHANGE THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE ISSUES NOR DOES IT...SHOULD YOU TAKE AWAY THE CONSTITUENTS' ABILITY TO DECIDE WHO IS BEST. MAYBE THAT 18-YEAR-OLD REALLY IS THAT EXCEPTIONAL OR THE PERSON HE'S RUNNING AGAINST IS REALLY THAT BAD. GIVE THE PEOPLE THE CHOICE. ANY EXPERIENCE CAN CHANGE SOMEONE. I HAD GREAT EXPERIENCES IN HIGH SCHOOL THAT TAUGHT ME TO WORK HARD, GO GET WHAT YOU WANT, AND FRANKLY SOME OF THOSE EXPERIENCES TRAINED ME TO GO OUT AND WIN A LEGISLATIVE SEAT. THAT IS A LIFE EXPERIENCE. LIFE EXPERIENCES COME IN ALL DIFFERENT SHAPES AND FORMS REGARDLESS OF WHAT AGE THEY HAPPEN AT. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. AND I'D URGE A RED VOTE ON THE BRACKET MOTION AND GREEN ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. THANK YOU. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR LARSON. SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, I WILL ADDRESS THE ISSUE THIS TIME. I WAS STARTING BY SAYING THAT THE PRESUMPTION IS MADE WITH REFERENCE TO A MINIMUM AGE. AND THE PRESUMPTION HAS BEEN MADE, EVEN THOUGH THERE MAY BE EXCEPTIONS ON BOTH SIDES OF IT, THAT 21 SHOULD BE THE DIVIDING LINE. IT DOESN'T MEAN THAT EVERYBODY UNDER 21 IS NOT COMPETENT OR THAT EVERYBODY OVER 21 IS. WHEN YOU MAKE AN ARBITRARY DEMARCATION LINE, THE WORD ARBITRARY LETS YOU KNOW THAT IT'S NOT BASED ON SOLID RESEARCH OR EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE, BUT FOR CONVENIENCE. IT'S LIKE WHAT YOU MIGHT CALL A CONVENTION. PEOPLE AGREE THAT THIS IS THE WAY IT'S GOING TO BE DONE. WHEN THE PEOPLE PUT TOGETHER THE CONSTITUTION, THEY PUT ONE AGE FOR THE PRESIDENT, A DIFFERENT AGE FOR PEOPLE WHO ARE IN CONGRESS, AND THERE WAS NO CORRELATION BETWEEN THE AGE AND INTELLIGENCE OR ANYTHING ELSE. BUT AN AGE IS UTILIZED BECAUSE IT ALLOWS YOU TO CATEGORIZE AND FUNCTION IN A WAY THAT'S REASONABLE AND RATIONAL. YOUNG PEOPLE DON'T HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEIR ACTIONS IN THE WAY THAT SOMEBODY IN PUBLIC OFFICE WOULD BE. CANDIDATES ARE IN A POSITION WHERE YOU CAN SAY THEY'RE IRRESPONSIBLE IN THE SENSE OF NOT BEING IN THE PROCESS OF MAKING DECISIONS. WHEN ONE OF THEM HOLLERS THAT, IF I SAW AN AMERICAN SERVICEMAN ON HIS KNEES, THEN I WOULD UNLEASH THE FULL POWER OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

EVERYBODY WHO KNOWS ANYTHING ABOUT THE MILITARY OR WORLD POLITICS LAUGHS AT THAT. BUT IT CAN BE MADE, BECAUSE HE'S REDUCING WHAT HE'S SAYING TO THE LEVEL OF INTELLIGENCE HE SUSPECTS THAT THE PUBLIC HAS, THE LACK OF INFORMATION, THE LACK OF KNOWLEDGE, AND THEY GO FOR THAT. WHEN IT COMES TIME TO OUR SETTING A STANDARD OR IMPLYING THAT WE SUPPORT THE SETTING OF THIS STANDARD AND IT MAKES US LOOK LIKE FOOLS, I WILL NOT BE A PART OF IT. AND ANYBODY, IN MY OPINION, WHO WOULD VOTE FOR SOMETHING LIKE THIS LOOKS LIKE A FOOL. AND ALL THE TIME THEY SPENT IN OFFICE HERE HAS MEANT NOTHING, HAS TAUGHT THEM NOTHING. AND IT'S WHY SOMEBODY LIKE ME WHO HAS ALL THE EDUCATION I GOT, ALL THE EXPERIENCE I GOT, NOT JUST IN THE LEGISLATURE, BUT ESPECIALLY HERE, COULD NOT SEE WHAT IT TAKES TO DO THIS OFFICE. IF I'D VOTE FOR SOMETHING LIKE THIS, I'D BE OUT OF MY MIND. PEOPLE COULD SAY, ERNIE, YOU SLIPPED INTO DEMENTIA. YOU NEED TO GO HAVE AN EXAMINATION TO SEE WHAT'S GOING ON IN YOUR MIND, BECAUSE YOU KNOW BETTER THAN THAT. EVERYBODY IN HERE KNOWS BETTER. IF YOU'VE GOT AN 18-YEAR-OLD CHILD, YOU WOULDN'T TURN THAT 18-YEAR-OLD CHILD LOOSE TO MANAGE ALL OF THE AFFAIRS OF THE FAMILY. YOU WOULDN'T DO IT. AND IT'S NO DISRESPECT TOWARD THE CHILD OR DENIGRATION OF THE CHILD. WE JUST KNOW BETTER. THERE ARE WHAT PEOPLE CALL RAGING HORMONES. SOMEBODY AT 18 IS NOT GOING TO BE ABLE EVEN TO CONTROL HIS OR HER TEMPER AS SOMEBODY OLDER HAS LEARNED HOW TO DO. THERE HAVE BEEN TIMES I FELT LIKE GRABBING SOMEBODY IN HERE AND SHAKING AND ALL THE THINGS YOU FEEL LIKE DOING, BUT THAT IS SOMETHING THAT PASSES THROUGH YOUR MIND. IT'S LIKE PEOPLE SAY ABOUT THINKING. YOU CANNOT STOP THE BIRDS FROM FLYING OVER YOUR HEAD, BUT YOU CAN STOP THEM FROM BUILDING A NEST IN YOUR HAIR. SO THOSE THOUGHTS MIGHT PASS THROUGH YOUR MIND--AND THAT'S WHAT THEY DO--THEY PASS THROUGH, THEY DON'T TAKE UP RESIDENCY THERE. AND THEY SAY THE THOUGHT IS THE FATHER TO THE DEED. YOU DON'T LET IT STAY THERE LONG ENOUGH TO LEAD YOU TO ACT ON IT. YOUNG PEOPLE DON'T HAVE TO DO THAT. EVEN IN SPORTING EVENTS, SOMETIMES A COACH HAS TO COLLAR A PLAYER, OTHER PLAYERS COLLAR THE PLAYER AND SAY, IF YOU DO THAT WE'RE GOING TO GET A 15-YARD PENALTY. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: ONE MINUTE. [LB26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I DON'T CARE. HE SAID SO AND SO OR HE DID SUCH AND SUCH, AND HE'LL BE DRAGGED OFF THE FIELD. AND YOU'RE GOING TO PUT SOMEBODY LIKE THAT IN THE LEGISLATURE AND PEOPLE WILL SAY, WELL, NOT

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

ALL YOUNG PEOPLE ARE LIKE THAT. WELL, NOT ALL YOUNG PEOPLE ARE EXCEPTIONAL IN THE WAY THAT SOME OF THESE PEOPLE DISCUSS IT. WE OUGHT TO BE THE EXAMPLE, THE PARADIGM OF WHAT WE WANT ON THE FLOOR OF THIS LEGISLATURE. ARE YOU THE EXAMPLE THAT YOU WOULD WANT REPLICATED 48 ADDITIONAL TIMES? I'D LOVE TO SEE 48 PEOPLE WITH MY CAPABILITY IN HERE. FIRST OF ALL, THEY'D UNDERSTAND WHAT I'M TALKING ABOUT. SECONDLY, THEY'D AGREE. AND THAT'S WHEN THEY WOULD SHOW THE GREATEST AMOUNT OF INTELLIGENCE. AN 18-YEAR-OLDER WOULDN'T EVEN UNDERSTAND WHAT I JUST SAID. YOU ALL CAN VOTE FOR IT IF YOU WANT TO. BUT IF ANYBODY ASKS ME WHAT DO I THINK OF IT, I WOULD SAY IT WAS THE CROWNING, IT WAS THE HEIGHT OF FOOLISHNESS. WE DON'T PUT THINGS OUT WE SHOULDN'T FOR A CONSTITUTIONAL VOTE TO SEE WHAT THE PEOPLE ARE GOING TO DO. WE HAVE TO ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY AND NOT PUT EVERYTHING TO A VOTE OF THE PEOPLE. WHAT DO YOU NEED TO BE HERE FOR?
[LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: TIME, SENATOR. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: DID YOU SAY TIME? [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: TIME, SIR. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: SENATOR BLOOMFIELD, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE ON YOUR BRACKET MOTION. STAND BY. SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. YOU JUST MADE IT IN THE NICK OF TIME AND THIS IS YOUR THIRD TIME.
[LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: MR. PRESIDENT, I WAS TRYING TO GET THERE AS QUICKLY AS I COULD, BUT AT MY ADVANCED AGE SOMETIMES THESE OLD BONES DON'T MOVE AS QUICKLY AS SOME OF THOSE OF MY YOUNGER COLLEAGUES. BUT I'LL BET MY MIND IS AS NIMBLE AS ANY OF THEM. AND THAT'S WHY I COULD BE TOTALLY PARALYZED OR ANYBODY ELSE COULD; BUT AS LONG AS THAT BRAIN IS WORKING, IT COULD GENERATE THOUGHTS AND IDEAS THAT WOULD STAGGER THE MIND OF EVERYBODY, BECAUSE THERE IS A MAN--AND I WON'T CALL HIS NAME--AND IF YOU DON'T KNOW WHO I'M TALKING ABOUT IT SHOWS HOW UNINFORMED PEOPLE ARE. BUT I DON'T THINK HE CAN MOVE ANYTHING, AS FAR AS PHYSICALLY, BUT HE'S DEEMED TO HAVE ONE OF THE MOST

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

PROFOUND MINDS ON THE FACE OF THIS EARTH RIGHT NOW AND HE LIES IMMOBILIZED IN A BED. YOU GOT TO PUT SOMETHING IN THAT BRAIN. WHEN SHIRLEY TEMPLE BECAME AN ADULT AND THEY ASKED HER, HOW COULD YOU LEARN ALL THE THINGS THAT YOU LEARNED AS A LITTLE GIRL? SHE GAVE THE BEST ANSWER THAT I'D EVER HEARD. SHE SAID, WHEN I WAS A LITTLE GIRL MY BRAIN WAS EMPTY, SO ALL IT COULD DO WAS ABSORB AND THEY JUST FILLED IT UP WITH THINGS. AND IT WAS EASY FOR ME TO LEARN THEM, BECAUSE THERE WAS NOTHING ELSE IN THERE INTERFERING. THAT'S THE WAY IT IS. BUT A LOT OF WHAT YOUNGER PEOPLE LEARN AND WHAT OLDER PEOPLE WHO HAVE NOT ANALYZED WILL DEAL WITH IS THE ACCUMULATION OF A LOT UNASSIMILATED, ORGANIZED INFORMATION. SO IT HAS NO MEANING WHATSOEVER UNLESS YOU GET ON JEOPARDY. AND EVEN THEN YOU HAVE TO BE ABLE TO BRING TO BEAR WHAT YOU KNOW IN ORDER TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS THAT THEY GIVE YOU. SO FOR US TO SAY, BECAUSE WE LIKE YOUNG PEOPLE WE OUGHT TO PUT SOMETHING LIKE THIS TO A VOTE OF THE PEOPLE, I THINK DOES NOT FOLLOW AT ALL AND IT PROVES THAT IN AGE THERE IS NOT ALWAYS WISDOM. BUT YOU MAKE CERTAIN PRESUMPTIONS IN ORDER THAT FUNCTIONING CAN OCCUR. AND I DO NOT THINK THIS IS A WISE CHOICE THAT A DELIBERATIVE BODY CHARGED WITH KNOWLEDGE, GOOD JUDGMENT WOULD MAKE. AND IF I WERE TALKING TO A ROOM FULL OF 18-YEAR-OLDERS, I'D SAY THE SAME THING. THE REASON SENATOR HALL AND I FOUGHT--AND WE WERE SUCCESSFUL--IN LOWERING THE AGE OF VOTING TO 18, BECAUSE IT HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH HOLDING AN OFFICE, BUT MAKING A PRESUMPTION THAT YOUNG PEOPLE IN SCHOOL AT THAT TIME WILL PROBABLY KNOW MORE ABOUT CIVICS THAN THEY WILL AT ANY OTHER TIME IN THEIR LIFE. THEY'LL BE CONSCIOUS OF THINGS THAT THEY WILL LOSE TRACK OF AS THEY GET OLDER. SO WHEN IT COMES TIME TO VOTE, THEY MIGHT BE ABLE TO SORT THROUGH ISSUES AND SEE THEM MORE REALISTICALLY THAN A LOT OF OLD PEOPLE WHO'VE FORGOTTEN EVERYTHING THEY EVER LEARNED, IF THEY EVER LEARNED IT IN THE FIRST PLACE. SO THAT RIGHT THERE WILL SHOW A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN VOTING AND HOLDING THE OFFICE. SO I WILL VOTE FOR THE BRACKET MOTION. I WILL VOTE AGAINST THIS PROPOSITION. AND I THINK RATHER THAN SEEING WHAT THE PUBLIC WILL DO, I THINK IT WILL SHOW OUR LACK OF JUDGMENT IF WE PUT IT OUT THERE FOR A VOTE OF THE PEOPLE. WHEN IT COMES TO A PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, WE CANNOT BE RESCUED BY A GOVERNOR. THIS DOES NOT GO TO THE GOVERNOR. AND IT'S TO MAKE THE LEGISLATURE SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE FOOLISHNESS THAT IT SUBMITS TO THE PEOPLE FOR VOTING. I SAY AGAIN, IF YOU HAVE AN 18-YEAR-OLD CHILD IN YOUR HOME, YOU WOULD NOT THINK FOR A MINUTE OF TURNING OVER THE RUNNING OF YOUR HOUSE AND HANDLING ALL THE RESPONSIBILITIES THAT GO WITH RUNNING THAT HOUSE TO

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

THAT 18-YEAR-OLDER. THEY HAVE MOODS TO A GREATER EXTENT THAN SOME OF US. THEY DON'T FEEL LIKE DOING SOMETHING, SO THEY'RE NOT GOING TO DO IT. THEY FEEL LIKE SAYING SOMETHING, SO THEY'RE GOING TO SAY IT. THEY FEEL LIKE PUNCHING SOMEBODY, SO THEY'LL DO IT. THAT'S BEING YOUNG. YOUNG PEOPLE ARE HUMAN BEINGS, AND THAT PARTICULAR SPECIES LEARNS FROM EXPERIENCE. AND THAT'S WHY IT TAKES MORE YEARS FOR THEM TO REACH MATURITY THAN IT TAKES A BUMBLEBEE OR EVEN ONE OF THE FOUR-FOOTED PREDATORS,... [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...BECAUSE THE LIFE THEY LIVE IS NOT WHERE IT'S: SURVIVE, AND IF YOU ARE NOT WATCHFUL, YOU'LL PERISH. YOU'RE NOT IN THAT KIND OF ENVIRONMENT. A PREDATOR MAY BECOME PREYED UPON BY THAT WHICH WOULD BECOME PREY IF THE PREDATOR WERE GROWN AND THE PREY WERE NOT. BUT IF THE PREY CATCHES THE PREDATOR AS A BABY, THE PREY, THE HUNTER BECOMES THE HUNTED. SO YOUNG PEOPLE NEED A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF TIME TO MATURE AND LEARN FROM EXPERIENCE. YOU ALL HAVEN'T GRASPED THAT. AND I THINK IT WOULD BE A TRAVESTY TO VOTE TO PUT THIS ON THE BALLOT. BUT THAT'S JUST ONE MAN'S OPINION. ONE INTELLIGENT, HIGHLY EDUCATED MAN WITH A DEGREE FROM CREIGHTON, WHICH THEY WISH I WOULDN'T TELL ANYBODY THAT I SUCCEEDED IN GETTING. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR CHAMBERS. SENATOR BLOOMFIELD, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE ON YOUR BRACKET MOTION. [LR26CA]

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. COLLEAGUES, YOU JUST HEARD FROM SENATOR CHAMBERS, PROBABLY BETTER THAN I COULD EVER PUT IT, WHY THIS SHOULD NOT GO TO A VOTE OF THE PEOPLE. IT'S NOT NECESSARY. I'M NOT GOING TO BELABOR THE BRACKET MOTION. I HOPE YOU SUPPORT IT AND WE CAN PUT THIS THING TO BED. BUT THAT'S UP TO EACH OF YOU IN HERE. I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY INITIATIVE PROPOSALS THERE ARE GOING TO BE ON THE BALLOT THIS YEAR. IT LOOKS LIKE THERE COULD BE A LOT OF THEM. WE HAVE A BILL, LB1072, STILL LAYING IN COMMITTEE. IT HAS TO DO WITH WHO CAN WORK ON FARM MACHINERY, WHETHER ONLY THE IMPLEMENT DEALER THAT SOLD THAT PIECE OF MACHINERY OR ANOTHER DEALER, SUCH AS JOHN DEERE, CAN WORK ON IT OR WHETHER WHAT WE USED TO REFER TO AS A SHADE TREE MECHANIC CAN WORK ON IT. THAT'S LB1072

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

COMING DOWN THE LINE. MAYBE WE SHOULD THROW THAT OUT TO A VOTE OF THE PEOPLE. WE CAN'T THROW EVERYTHING BACK TO THE PEOPLE. THAT'S WHAT WE'RE ELECTED TO HANDLE HERE. I ASK YOU TO SUPPORT THE BRACKET MOTION AND LET'S PUT THIS PUPPY TO BED. THANK YOU. [LR26CA LB1072]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR BLOOMFIELD. YOU'VE HEARD THE CLOSING ON MO170 TO BRACKET THIS BILL UNTIL 4-20 OF '16. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR VOTE AYE; OPPOSED VOTE NAY. PLEASE RECORD, MR. CLERK. [LR26CA]

ASSISTANT CLERK: 5 AYES, 28 NAYS ON THE MOTION TO BRACKET THE BILL, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: MOTION FAILS. MR. CLERK, YOU HAVE AN AMENDMENT? [LR26CA]

ASSISTANT CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, SENATOR SCHUMACHER WOULD OFFER FA83. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGE 449.) [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: SENATOR SCHUMACHER, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE BODY. THIS AMENDMENT, I THINK, FIXES THE ISSUES THAT I RAISED BEFORE. AND THOSE ISSUES RELATE TO NOTHING SUBSTANTIVE, NOTHING WHETHER YOU'RE FOR OR AGAINST 18-YEAR-OLDS VOTING OR RUNNING FOR THIS OR THAT OFFICE OR BEING APPOINTED TO THIS OR THAT OFFICE OR WHETHER OR NOT THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT SHOULD EXTEND TO APPOINTED MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE OR THE SIX-MONTH REQUIREMENT IF YOU REMOVE YOURSELF FROM THE DISTRICT. IT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THE MERITS. IT IS PROCEDURE. THERE IS GREAT UNCERTAINTY EVEN THOUGH IT'S GETTING CLEARER AND CLEARER THE COURT IS GOING TO BE VERY, VERY FINICKY WITH REGARD TO WHAT A SINGLE SUBJECT IS. I'VE WATCHED THAT FOR YEARS DEVELOP, AND I SPENT A LOT OF MONEY IN THE SUPREME COURT WITH REGARD TO THOSE ISSUES. AND THE TEST SEEMS TO BE IS WHETHER OR NOT A VOTER COULD BE FOR PART OF IT AND AGAINST ANOTHER PART OF IT AND WHETHER OR NOT THEY WERE DISTINCT. OUR CONSTITUTION MAKES SEVERAL THINGS DISTINCT. IT JUST DOESN'T HAVE ONE AGE LIMIT. IT HAS A LIMIT FOR...THAT RELATES TO THE MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE. IT'S NOT OUR IDEA, NOT SENATOR LARSON'S IDEA. THAT WAS THE FOUNDERS' IDEA, THE PEOPLE'S, THAT

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

HAS A PROVISION RELATING TO AGE FOR THE GOVERNOR AND LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR. SOMEBODY OBVIOUSLY THOUGHT THAT WAS SEPARATE AND DIFFERENT FROM THE LEGISLATURE, BECAUSE THEY PUT IT IN THERE THAT WAY. AND THAT'S ENTITLED TO A HEAVY PRESUMPTION. THEY HAVE A PROVISION RELATING TO THE ELIGIBLE AGE FOR CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT AND MEMBER OF THE SUPREME COURT. SOMEBODY THOUGHT THAT WAS A DISTINCT ISSUE THAT THEY NEEDED TO ADDRESS SEPARATELY. AND THEN IT HAS A PROVISION FOR ALL OTHER PUBLIC OFFICES. SO THIS IS NOT SOMETHING WE'RE JUST COOKING UP FOR THE HECK OF IT TO AGGRAVATE SENATOR LARSON. IT'S SEPARATE ISSUES. AND IT ALSO, THE PARTICULAR LANGUAGE HERE, ADDS FOR SOME REASON SOMETHING NOT EVEN RELATED TO AGE, AND THAT IS THIS RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT, WHAT HAPPENS IF AN APPOINTED LEGISLATOR REMOVES HIMSELF FROM THE DISTRICT. NOTHING TO DO WITH AGE. SO THOSE ARE FIVE DIFFERENT THINGS WHICH A REASONABLE VOTER MIGHT WANT TO VOTE DIFFERENTLY ON. MIGHT BE FOR PART, AGAINST OTHERS. THOSE ARE SEPARATE SUBJECTS, I BELIEVE, IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WAY THE SUPREME COURT HAS BEEN WRITING THOSE OPINIONS. NOW, YOU CAN BE GAMBLERS IF YOU WANT. AND IF YOU ARE, YOU'LL SAY, WELL, SHOOT THE MOON. WE'RE GOING TO THROW ALL THESE FOUR AGE CATEGORIES IN ONE BASKET AND WE'RE ALSO GOING TO KICK IN FOR GOOD MEASURE AND GOOD GIGGLE THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT JUST BECAUSE. AND I THINK THAT'S GAMBLING TOO MUCH WHEN WE CAN FIX THE PROBLEM BY SIMPLY SAYING, THIS WILL BE PRESENTED TO THE VOTERS AS FIVE DIFFERENT QUESTIONS AND LET THEM HAVE FREEDOM OF CHOICE. THEY CAN YES, YES, YES, YES, YES AND IT'S ALL DONE, OR YES, NO, NO, YES, WHICHEVER WAY. BUT I THINK THAT'S PRUDENT, AND I RAISE THE ISSUE BECAUSE I THINK, SERIOUSLY, SOMEONE MAY RAISE THE ISSUE. THERE'S GOING TO BE A LOT OF LITIGATION IN THE SUPREME COURT. WE KNOW THAT THE DEATH PENALTY...NOT KNOW, BUT WE'RE PRETTY SURE THAT THE DEATH PENALTY THING WILL GET THERE. ALMOST INVARIABLY THERE WILL BE A CHALLENGE TO THE INDIAN-SPONSORED GAMING PETITIONS OF ONE DESCRIPTION OR ANOTHER, THERE ALWAYS IS. LORD KNOWS WHAT OTHER PETITIONS MAY BE CHALLENGED. AND SO THE SUPREME COURT'S GOING TO BE WELL VERSED IN THESE KIND OF ISSUES. AND THEIR GENERAL TREND OF THOSE DECISIONS IS, YOU SEPARATE OUT THOSE ISSUES SO YOU DON'T HAVE A SITUATION WHERE YOU FORCE A VOTER TO VOTE YES ON SOMETHING HE IS OPPOSED TO BECAUSE HE REALLY LIKES SOMETHING THAT COULD HAVE BEEN SEPARATED OUT. AND SO THIS IS A SIMPLE FIX. THE ONLY REASON YOU'D BE CONCERNED WITH IT IS THAT YOU'D BE CONCERNED THAT THE VOTER MAY SAY, YOU KNOW, I'M GENERALLY FOR IT, BUT I SURE DON'T THINK IT FITS THE SUPREME COURT OR THE GOVERNOR. THE FOUNDERS WERE SMART WHEN THEY

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SAID DIFFERENT AGES FOR THOSE OFFICES THAN SOME OF THE OTHER OFFICES. HERE'S YOUR FREEDOM OF CHOICE ON A GOOD MEASURE, WHETHER OR NOT THE BODY WANTS TO GAMBLE OR WANTS TO PLAY IT SAFE. THANK YOU.
[LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR SCHUMACHER. SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. MR. PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, I SHALL NOT ADDRESS SENATOR SCHUMACHER'S PROPOSAL. IT PROBABLY WILL BE ONE OF THOSE THAT WILL NOT BE GIVEN SERIOUS CONSIDERATION, SO I WILL SPEAK AGAIN IN GENERAL TERMS. I WOULD BE PRESUMPTUOUS TO SAY THAT I CARE ABOUT THE LEGISLATURE AS AN INSTITUTION MORE THAN ANYBODY ELSE ON THIS FLOOR, SO I WILL MODIFY IT AND SAY I CARE AS MUCH ABOUT IT AS ANYBODY ON THIS FLOOR. EVEN THOUGH A LOT OF FOOLISHNESS COMES FROM THIS BODY, I WANT TO DO WHAT I CAN TO MINIMIZE IT BECAUSE I AM A PART OF IT. AND WHATEVER IS SAID ABOUT THE LEGISLATURE AS A WHOLE GENERALLY APPLIES TO EVERYBODY IN THE LEGISLATURE. WHEN YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT CREATING A CATEGORY OF VOTERS--FORGETTING THE DISTINCTIONS THAT SENATOR SCHUMACHER IS POINTING OUT EXISTS IN THE CONSTITUTION RIGHT NOW WHEN IT COMES TO VARIOUS OFFICES AND THE AGES CONNECTED TO THEM--WHEN YOU CREATE THIS NEW GROUP FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, YOU HAVE TO LOOK AT THE GENERALITY OF THAT GROUP, NOT CERTAIN OUTSTANDING INDIVIDUALS. THE FACT THAT YOU HAVE TO POINT OUT AND CAN SPECIFY THOSE FEW OUTSTANDING INDIVIDUALS WILL MAKE IT CLEAR THAT THEY ARE THE EXCEPTION TO THE RULE THAT GOVERNS THAT CLASS. WHENEVER WE HAVE A VERY SERIOUS MATTER BEFORE US, ESPECIALLY IF IT TOUCHES ON THE CONSTITUTION, PEOPLE TALK ABOUT HOW THEY FEEL, WHAT THEY THINK. THEY HAVEN'T READ THE CONSTITUTION FROM COVER TO COVER. THEY HAVEN'T READ ANY CASES INTERPRETING, CONSTRUING, OR APPLYING THE CONSTITUTION. THE CONSTITUTION IS NOT WHAT THOSE WORDS ARE THAT YOU FIND IN THE TEXT WHEN YOU READ THAT DOCUMENT. THE CONSTITUTION IS WHAT THE COURT HAS SAID THOSE THINGS MEAN. AND THAT'S WHY A LOT OF THESE OFF-BRAND, NITWIT GROUPS, LIKE THOSE OUT IN OREGON, WILL SAY, THE CONSTITUTION GIVES ME THESE RIGHTS. FIRST OF ALL, THEY'RE NOT EVEN READING LITERALLY THE WORDS IN THE CONSTITUTION. BUT WHAT YOUNG PEOPLE WILL SEE, IF ANYTHING, AND HEAR...THEY'RE NOT GOING TO SEE WHAT WE DO AND THEY'RE NOT GOING TO HEAR WHAT WE SAY, BUT THEY'LL CERTAINLY SEE WHAT'S HAPPENING OUT THERE IN OREGON. THEY WILL PUT

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

TOGETHER VARIOUS WAYS THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS RESPOND WHEN BLACK PEOPLE AND THEIR WHITE ALLIES WILL DEMONSTRATE AGAINST POLICE BRUTALITY. THESE WHITE-RUN POLICE AGENCIES WILL BRING OUT MILITARY VEHICLES. THEY WILL USE MILITARY WEAPONRY. THEY WILL DRESS IN MILITARY GARB FOR PEOPLE WHO ARE UNARMED AND SIMPLY EXERCISING THEIR RIGHT TO PETITION THEIR GOVERNMENT FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES. BUT WHEN YOU HAVE THESE RACIST, WHITE INSURRECTIONISTS WHO HAVE NOT ONLY TAKEN OVER FEDERAL PROPERTY BUT ARE DESTROYING ARTIFACTS ON THE LAND OF THE NATIVE AMERICANS, WE SEE THE HYPOCRISY OF AMERICA. AND PEOPLE AROUND THE WORLD SEE IT. THE TALIBAN WERE FIRST ATTACKED...AND BY THE WAY, TALIBAN IS A PLURAL WORD, IT IS NOT SINGULAR. THEY SHOULD NOT SAY THE TALIBAN IS, THE TALIBAN ARE. THEY WERE DESTROYING... [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...STATUARY, OTHER THINGS THAT SYMBOLIZE THE CULTURE. BUT NOW THAT THE NATIVE PEOPLES IN THIS COUNTRY HAVE ARTIFACTS ON THEIR LAND BEING DESTROYED BY THESE WHITE, RACIST CRIMINALS, NOTHING IS DONE ABOUT IT. BUT AMERICA CAN SAY, WE'LL GO TO WAR BECAUSE OF WHAT THE TALIBAN IS DOING. THEY DESTROYED A STATUE OF BUDDHA. BUT WHAT ABOUT THE PEOPLE IN THIS COUNTRY? WE WHO ARE NOT WHITE COUNT FOR NOTHING. I OUGHT TO LET YOU DO WHATEVER YOU WANT TO DO TO THIS CONSTITUTION. YOU DON'T RESPECT IT. HOW CAN YOU RESPECT IT WHEN YOU DON'T EVEN KNOW WHAT IT IS? AND AS I'VE SAID MANY TIMES, I'M TALKING TO THE PEOPLE WHO ARE WATCHING US. I WANT TO SEPARATE MYSELF FROM THE FOOLISHNESS THAT GOES ON IN THIS BODY. I WANT TO SHOW AN AWARENESS OF THE VIOLATION OF THE LAW BY THESE WHITE, ARMED RACISTS AND THE FACT THAT THIS WHITE GOVERNMENT WILL DO NOTHING ABOUT IT. BUT REMEMBER HOW THEY DID ABOUT THOSE WHO OCCUPIED WALL STREET, USING TEAR GAS. CAME AGAINST... [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: TIME, SENATOR. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR CHAMBERS. (VISITORS INTRODUCED.)
SENATOR LARSON, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SENATOR LARSON: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I RISE AGAINST FA83. I THINK AS WE MOVE FORWARD THROUGH THIS, SENATOR SCHUMACHER IS USING, SPECIFICALLY, AS I SAID, THE SUPREME COURT RULING THAT FOCUSED ON HISTORIC HORSE RACING AS HIS TEST AND MOVING THROUGH WHAT HE HAS SAID THE SUPREME COURT HAS CONTINUED TO MOVE TOWARDS. YOU KNOW, IF SENATOR SCHUMACHER WANTS TO WORK BETWEEN GENERAL AND SELECT SPECIFICALLY ON THE RESIDENCY ISSUE WHICH, AGAIN, IS ESSENTIALLY A SMALL CLEANUP ADDING APPOINTED INTO ELECTED AS WELL BECAUSE THAT'S NOT IN OUR CONSTITUTION, I'M HAPPY TO DO THAT. BUT IN TERMS OF THE REST OF THE SUBJECT OR THE REST OF THE ISSUES, SPLITTING IT OUT INTO FIVE DIFFERENT QUESTIONS I THINK IS HIGHLY UNNECESSARY. A QUICK HISTORICAL OVERVIEW. AGAIN, WHEN IT CAME TO THE HISTORIC HORSE RACING WHAT WE PUT ON THE BALLOT WAS: DO YOU WANT TO AUTHORIZE HISTORIC HORSE RACING AS ONE QUESTION. AND THE SECOND QUESTION WAS...IN THERE WAS: THE MONEY IS GOING TO X, Y AND Z. THAT'S WHAT THE COURT SAID TWO QUESTIONS WERE. THIS, VERY SPECIFICALLY, ONLY DEALS WITH ELECTION AND AGES. HE'S SAYING, BECAUSE IT DEALS WITH DIFFERENT BRANCHES THAT IT'S MULTIPLE QUESTIONS. BUT IN REALITY, THE QUESTION IS THE SAME IN THE SENSE THAT IT'S FOR ALL ELECTED AND APPOINTED OFFICIALS. THERE'S NOT MULTIPLE QUESTIONS HERE, COLLEAGUES. IT IS ONE QUESTION. IF SENATOR SCHUMACHER WANTS TO WORK SPECIFICALLY ON HIS CONCERNS AND THE RESIDENCY ON APPOINTED MEMBERS AND THAT, I'M HAPPY TO DO THAT BETWEEN SELECT OR BETWEEN GENERAL AND SELECT FILE OR AT LEAST DISCUSS THOSE CONCERNS WITH HIM. BUT TO SPLIT IT OUT INTO FIVE DIFFERENT QUESTIONS IS NOT WHAT IS NEEDED AND I THINK NOT AN ACCURATE READING OF...AND WE CAN ALL SAY, IT WILL BE THE COURT THAT DECIDES OR SOMEBODY WOULD HAVE TO CHALLENGE THIS TO GET IT TO THE SUPREME COURT, FIRST OF ALL. BUT, YOU KNOW, WE CAN'T SAY IT WILL OR WILL NOT, BUT I THINK IF WE'RE USING THAT CONCERN, THAT ONE, LITTLE, SPECIFIC CONCERN, I CAN WORK ON...WITH SENATOR SCHUMACHER ON, BUT THE REST OF IT IS A SINGLE QUESTION. AND I'D MAKE THE ARGUMENT EVEN THAT IS PART OF THAT SINGLE QUESTION IN TERMS OF JUST A SMALL CLARIFICATION WITHIN OUR CONSTITUTION...THAT CONSTITUTIONAL LANGUAGE. SO, COLLEAGUES, I RISE IN OPPOSITION TO FA83. AGAIN, I WOULD HOPE MAYBE SENATOR SCHUMACHER EVEN PULLS THIS IF HE WANTS TO DISCUSS THAT RESIDENCY ISSUE. MAYBE HE WON'T AND HE'LL TAKE IT TO A VOTE. BUT I URGE YOU TO VOTE RED ON FA83 AND, AGAIN, A GREEN ON LR26CA. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR LARSON. SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. AND AS WE GET DOWN TO SPECIFIC THINGS, I EXPECT PEOPLE NOT TO TALK AS MUCH, BECAUSE THEY DON'T UNDERSTAND IT. SO I'D LIKE TO ASK SENATOR LARSON A QUESTION, IF I MAY. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: SENATOR LARSON, WILL YOU YIELD? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: YES. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SENATOR LARSON, WHO PREPARED THE LANGUAGE FOR THIS PROPOSAL THAT YOU HAVE? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: IT WOULD BE MYSELF AND MY LEGISLATIVE AIDE TOGETHER. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ARE YOU AWARE THAT RESIDENCY HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH AGE? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: YES. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: DO YOU SEE TWO SUBJECTS BASED ON THAT? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: SENATOR CHAMBERS, THE RESIDENCY ISSUE THAT SENATOR SCHUMACHER IS BRINGING UP HAS TO DO WITH THE APPOINTMENT PROCESS AND WE JUST ADD APPOINTMENT INTO THE CURRENT LANGUAGE. AND SO I DON'T NECESSARILY THINK THAT WE ARE BRINGING IN THE RESIDENCY ISSUE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: OKAY. WELL, WHAT YOU THINK DOESN'T COUNT. WHAT YOUR AIDE THINKS DOESN'T COUNT. IT'S WHAT COURTS HAVE SAID THAT COUNT. NOW ON THIS FLOOR SOMETIMES PEOPLE CAN SAY, I THINK THIS, AND IT CARRIES WATER. AND THAT'S THE PROBLEM. YOUNG PEOPLE WOULD BE EVEN MORE IMPRESSIONABLE THAN YOU AND YOUR AIDE. YOU GET SOMETHING IN YOUR HEAD AND YOU SAY, I BELIEVE THIS WITH ALL MY HEART, SO YOU WANT

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

TO PUT THAT IN THE CONSTITUTION. IT'S NOT MY PROPOSAL. I WOULDN'T TRY TO STRAIGHTEN IT OUT. AND I'M NOT INTERESTED IN WHAT SENATOR SCHUMACHER IS TRYING TO DO AS FAR AS DEALING WITH THIS PARTICULAR THING THAT IS BEFORE US. THE QUESTION THAT THE "BIBBLE" PUT WAS, WHO CAN BRING A CLEAN THING OUT OF AN UNCLEAN THING? AND THE ANSWER IS, NO, NOT ONE. THE UPDATED VERSION OF THAT IS, WHO CAN MAKE A SILK PURSE FROM A SOW'S EAR? THAT'S THE WAY I VIEW THIS. IT'S NONSENSE. IT'S SOMETHING THAT IS BENEATH THE LEGISLATURE. UNFORTUNATELY, WE DON'T HAVE PEOPLE WHO ARE LEARNED IN THE CONSTITUTION OR EVEN THE LAWS ON THE STATUTE BOOKS NOW. I LISTEN TO THE DEBATES THAT WE HAVE. I LISTEN TO THE GUN BILL. I LOOKED AT THE TRASH THAT THE NRA SENT OVER HERE AND HAD YOU ALL DEFENDING AND SUPPORTING BECAUSE YOU DIDN'T READ IT; AND IF YOU READ IT, YOU DIDN'T UNDERSTAND IT BECAUSE THE NRA TOLD YOU WHAT TO DO. AND THAT'S WHAT WE WERE CONFRONTED WITH THE OTHER DAY. AND THAT'S WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF WE PUT OTHERS IN HERE WHO ARE EVEN LESS MATURE THAN YOU. THEY'D BE MORE CORRUPTIBLE THAN YOU. AND SPEAKING OF THAT, NOT ONLY DO I FIND BRINGING LOBBYISTS INTO THIS BUILDING, INTO A ROOM DEDICATED TO THE LEGISLATORS...IT'S NOT WHERE THEY BRING A SACK LUNCH, THEY PREPARE...THEY TURN IT INTO A KITCHEN, A KITCHEN AND A SERVING LINE IN THE LEGISLATURE. I THINK CONGRESS DOES HAVE A CAFETERIA, BUT I'M NOT AWARE OF THEM TURNING ANY HEARING ROOMS OR ANYTHING ELSE THAT IS RELATED TO THE CONGRESS INTO A KITCHEN, A SERVING LINE, AND A PLACE TO SERVE THOSE WHO ARE DOING THE COUNTRY'S BUSINESS, SUPPOSEDLY. BUT THEN WHEN I CONSIDER THAT BEING A POLITICIAN IS A BEGGING INDUSTRY, I SHOULDN'T BE SURPRISED. ALL THESE CARDS THAT GO OUT--COME TO MY FUNDRAISER, GIVE ME SOME MONEY. WELL, MAYBE A SANDWICH WON'T SWAY YOU, MAYBE A SACK LUNCH, BUT THE HAND THAT FEEDS CONTROLS. AND WHEN THEY GIVE YOU MONEY AND YOU BEG THEM FOR THAT MONEY, THEN THEY EXPECT SOMETHING IN RETURN. THESE LOBBYISTS MIGHT SOUND FOOLISH, BUT THEY'RE NOT FOOLS AND THEY KNOW WHAT THEY'RE DOING. WHY DO YOU THINK THEY INVEST IN YOU? AN INVESTMENT IS SOMETHING PUT OUT THERE WITH THE EXPECTATION THERE WILL BE A RETURN. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: IF YOU DON'T EXPECT A RETURN, IT'S NOT AN INVESTMENT. IT'S A GIFT OR A CONTRIBUTION OR A DONATION. THEY ARE INVESTING IN YOU. AND WHEN THEIR PRINCIPAL GIVES THEM A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF MONEY TO SPEND, IT'S AN INVESTMENT AND THEY WANT TO

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

INFLUENCE YOU. AND YOU OUGHT TO BE ABOVE THAT. BUT IF YOU'RE NOT ABOVE SPONGING, MOOCHING OFF THE LOBBYISTS, THEN I SHOULDN'T LOOK FOR YOU TO LOOK HIGHER THAN THAT, TO OTHER PRINCIPLES THAT OUGHT TO GUIDE US IN OUR CONDUCT. THE VERY THING THAT PEOPLE SAID THEY PUT TERM LIMITS IN FOR WAS YOU BEING DOMINATED BY THE LOBBYISTS. THAT EATING FROM THE LOBBYISTS IS SO IMPORTANT TO YOU, IT'S SUCH AN ESSENTIAL PART THAT YOU WON'T STAY HERE AND DO YOUR BUSINESS IF THE LOBBYISTS DON'T FEED YOU, GIVE YOU SOMETHING TO DRINK AND SOMETHING TO EAT? I'LL TELL YOU WHAT I'LL DO, IN ORDER TO TRY TO HELP CHILDREN AT ST. JUDE'S, I WILL BORROW MONEY IF I HAVE TO, AND I WILL BUY SANDWICHES FOR YOU ALL WHEN WE'RE IN THE LATTER DAYS, BUT YOU HAVE TO EAT THEM IN YOUR OFFICE... [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: TIME, SENATOR. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: AND THEN YOU CAN COME UP HERE AND DO YOUR WORK. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR CHAMBERS. THOSE STILL WISHING TO SPEAK: SENATORS SCHUMACHER, HANSEN, MORFELD, AND OTHERS. SENATOR SCHUMACHER, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE BODY. THERE'S NOT A NECESSITY TO KILL A LOT OF TIME ON THIS. THE AMENDMENT BASICALLY SAYS, LOOK AT SENATOR LARSON'S LANGUAGE, LOOK AT THE CONSTITUTION AND SAY IT'S OKAY. CONSTITUTION CREATES SEPARATE CATEGORIES FOR SEPARATE...AND STANDARDS FOR SEPARATE OFFICES. THAT SET THE STAGE, CREATED THE DIFFERENT ISSUES. AND ALL THIS AMENDMENT SAYS IS WHEN WE PUT THIS ON THE BALLOT THE VOTERS WILL HAVE CHOICE, SO THAT THEY WON'T HAVE TO VOTE FOR IT ALL IF THEY DON'T LIKE THE PART. THERE ARE DIFFERENT PROVISIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION WE'RE AMENDING HERE. SO IT SAYS, FIRST QUESTION WITH TWO LITTLE BOXES YES AND NO WILL RELATE TO THE AGE...THE ELIGIBLE AGE FOR MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE. YOU THINK THAT SHOULD BE 18, YOU MARK YES AND GO DOWN TO THE NEXT QUESTION. SECOND ONE, GOVERNOR AND THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR. YOU LIKE THAT IDEA, YOU MARK YES AND GO ON. IF YOU DON'T LIKE IT, YOU MARK NO. CHIEF JUSTICE OR JUDGE OF THE SUPREME COURT, TWO BOXES THERE. ALL OTHER OFFICES, TWO BOXES. AND WHAT DOES THE HAMBURGER AD SAY? YOU KNOW, WE GIVE YOU FREEDOM OF CHOICE. WE ARE PUTTING THIS BEFORE THE

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

VOTERS TO ASCERTAIN THEIR WILL, NOT TO TRICK THEM OR FORCE THEM. SO, LET'S ASCERTAIN THEIR WILL. AND THE FINAL BOX THAT ADDRESSES THIS THING, WHICH I'M NOT SURE HOW IT'S EVEN RELATED TO ANYTHING ABOUT AGE, THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR APPOINTED MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE. SUPREME COURT HAS SAID THAT WHEN YOU STICK LANGUAGE IN THE CONSTITUTION IT MUST HAVE MEANING, FOR SOME REASON WE'RE STICKING IT IN THERE, SO IT MUST HAVE MEANING AND IT MUST BE A SEPARATE SUBJECT. I REALLY DON'T CARE WHETHER OR NOT THIS FLOOR AMENDMENT PASSES OR NOT. IN SOME RESPECTS, ONE OF THE GREATEST JOYS IN LIFE, AT LEAST--NOT GREATEST JOYS, BUT A NICE LITTLE PERK IN LIFE--IS BEING ABLE TO SAY, I TOLD YOU SO. SO YOU CAN VOTE THIS DOWN AND YOU CAN TAKE THE RISK THAT THE COURT'S GOING TO SAY, HEY, LEGISLATURE, READ WHAT WE SAID. WE'RE REALLY PICKY ABOUT THIS SINGLE-SUBJECT STUFF. GO BACK, DO IT AGAIN. OR WORSE YET, HAVE THE PEOPLE VOTE FOR IT AND PUT THE COURT IN A POSITION WHERE THEY GOT TO THROW IT OUT AFTER THE VOTE OR SOMEBODY'S ELECTION IS CHALLENGED BECAUSE THE VOTE VIOLATED THE LAW. LET'S BE PRUDENT. BUT I'M NOT TRYING TO BURN UP TIME HERE, HONESTLY AREN'T. GENERALLY, I KIND OF LIKE THE IDEA OF 18-YEAR-OLDS BEING ABLE TO HOLD SOME OFFICE, BUT NOT NECESSARILY ALL OFFICES, PARTICULARLY THE SUPREME COURT. SO THAT'S WHAT I SAY. AND I REALLY JUST PREFER THAT WE MOVE ON TO A VOTE AND VOTE THIS UP OR DOWN AND MOVE ON TO OTHER BUSINESS. THANK YOU. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR SCHUMACHER. SENATOR HANSEN, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR HANSEN: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I APPRECIATE THE GOOD INTENTIONS OF SENATOR SCHUMACHER, BUT I'M RISING TODAY TO CONTINUE MY SUPPORT FOR LR26CA. AND ON FA83, I FEEL LIKE DEALING WITH THESE ISSUES MIGHT BE A BIT OF A GRAND MOTION TO DEAL WITH IN A FLOOR AMENDMENT AT THE MOMENT WHEN WE'RE DEALING WITH DIFFERING INTERPRETATIONS OF SUPREME COURT DOCUMENTS. I WOULD ENCOURAGE, HOWEVER THE BODY NECESSARILY FEELS ON FA83, THAT THEY CONTINUE THE SUPPORT FOR LR26CA. AND THAT IF WE GET TO A VOTE ON THAT CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, WE CAN WORK ON THIS BETWEEN GENERAL AND SELECT AND MAKE SURE WE HAVE A CLARITY ON THE ISSUE. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR HANSEN. SENATOR MORFELD, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SENATOR MORFELD: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. AND I SAT DOWN AND TALKED TO SENATOR SCHUMACHER ABOUT THIS, AND HE CLEARLY HAS A BETTER GRASP WITH SOME OF THE CASE LAW THAT'S OUT THERE. AND I WANT TO ECHO WHAT SENATOR HANSEN SAID. I WOULD PREFER IT TO BE JUST ONE QUESTION ON THE BALLOT. I THINK THAT'S THE LEAST CONFUSING OR LEAST OR PROBABLY THE CLEANEST WAY OF GOING ABOUT THAT. THAT BEING SAID, I ALSO NEEDED TO LOOK AT THE CASE LAW AND SOME OF THE DIFFERENT PROVISIONS THAT SENATOR SCHUMACHER'S REFERENCING. SO I'M NOT NECESSARILY OPPOSED TO HIS LEGAL ANALYSIS OR WHATEVER THE CASE MAY BE. WHAT I AM SAYING IS THAT I DON'T THINK THIS IS SOMETHING WE SHOULD DO A FLOOR AMENDMENT ON. I WANT TO CONSULT WITH LEGAL COUNSEL, CONSULT WITH SENATOR SCHUMACHER, AND MAKE SURE WE HAVE A GOOD GRASP OF MAKING SURE THIS IS A CONSTITUTIONAL WAY OF PRESENTING THE BALLOT QUESTION. SO I WOULD ASK THAT WE VOTE DOWN FA83 AND THAT WE WORK TOGETHER BETWEEN GENERAL AND SELECT TO ENSURE THAT WE HAVE THE PROPER LANGUAGE FOR CONSTITUTIONALITY. THANK YOU. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR MORFELD. SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED AND THIS IS YOUR THIRD TIME. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I'M NOT OFFERING MOTIONS, I'M NOT OFFERING AMENDMENTS, BUT WHENEVER SOMETHING IS BEFORE US I'M GOING TO SPEAK. I CAN RANGE FAR AFIELD ON SOMETHING LIKE THIS BECAUSE, AS I SAID, I THINK IT'S POPPYCOCK. I THINK IT'S NONSENSICAL. SO I'M NOT GOING TO WASTE TIME AND VALUABLE MENTAL ENERGY TRYING TO FASHION REASONABLE, RATIONAL ARGUMENTS BECAUSE I'M NOT DEALING WITH REASONABLE, RATIONAL PEOPLE ON AN ISSUE WHICH IN AND OF ITSELF IS UNREASONABLE AND IRRATIONAL. THAT'S THE WAY I SEE THIS. THIS THAT YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT IS YOUR CONSTITUTION. THIS IS WHITE PEOPLE'S CONSTITUTION, BUT IT'S NOT WHITE PEOPLE'S WORK. I'M GOING TO TELL YOU ALL SOMETHING TO SHOW YOU HOW WHITE PEOPLE DON'T LISTEN TO US. THEY HAD A PROGRAM ON TELEVISION CALLED DESIGNING WOMEN. THESE THREE OR FOUR WHITE WOMEN HAD A DESIGN SHOP, THEY DESIGNED HOUSES AND THINGS LIKE THAT, THAT'S WHY THEY GOT THE TERM. AND THEY HAD A BLACK--DOWN IN ATLANTA, GEORGIA--A BLACK GUY WHO'S PORTRAYED MORE OR LESS AS A EUNUCH NAMED ANTHONY BOUVIER, WHO WAS AN EX-CON; FUNNY PROGRAM, CLEVER. BUT HE WAS TALKING TO THESE WOMEN ONE TIME AND HE SAID, YOU KNOW WHAT? WHITE PEOPLE DON'T LISTEN TO US. AND THEY SAID, CAN YOU GIVE US AN EXAMPLE? HE SAID, WELL, YEAH, THIS FELLOW'S WORKING FOR THIS OLD WHITE WOMAN HE'D WORKED FOR FOR TEN YEARS.

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

AND SHE FINALLY GOT AROUND TO SAYING THAT HE'D BEEN SO LOYAL, THAT SHE COULD FEEL DEATH CREEPING UP ON HER AND SHE WANTED TO SHOW HER APPRECIATION. SO SHE WANTED TO PUT HIM IN HER WILL, BUT SHE DIDN'T KNOW HOW TO SPELL HIS NAME. AND SO HE LOOKED AT HER. HE SAID, YOU DON'T KNOW HOW TO SPELL MY NAME? SHE SAID, NO. HE SAID, YOU DON'T EVEN KNOW MY NAME. SHE SAID, WELL, YES, I DO. HE SAID, WHAT'S MY NAME? SHE SAID, "BAMANITIOUS." HE SAID, "BAMANITIOUS," THAT'S NOT MY NAME. SHE SAID, I'VE BEEN CALLING YOU "BAMANITIOUS" FOR TEN YEARS AND YOU ALWAYS ANSWER. IF IT'S NOT YOUR NAME, WHY DID YOU ANSWER? HE SAID, WE DOWN HERE IN THE SOUTH AND YOU KNOW THAT YOU WHITE FOLKS LIKE TO GIVE US NAMES, LIKE JUPITER OR VENUS MILO CLEVENS (PHONETIC). SO IN ORDER TO KEEP MY JOB, IF I'VE GOT TO BE "BAMANITIOUS" TO YOU, THAT'S WHO I'LL BE. SHE SAID, WELL, I ASKED YOU WHAT YOUR NAME WAS AND YOU SAID "BAMANITIOUS." HE SAID, NO MA'AM. I DIDN'T SAY "BAMANITIOUS." YOU DIDN'T LISTEN TO ME. SHE SAID, WELL, I DISTINCTLY HEARD YOU SAY "BAMANITIOUS." NO, MA'AM. WELL, "BAMANITIOUS," DO YOU REMEMBER ME ASKING YOU THAT QUESTION, WHAT SHOULD I CALL YOU? HE SAID, YES, MA'AM, I REMEMBER THE QUESTION. AND YOU DON'T REMEMBER SAYING YOUR NAME IS "BAMANITIOUS"? HE SAID, NO MA'AM. YOU ASKED ME WHAT YOU COULD CALL ME AND I SAID YOU CAN CALL ME BY MY INITIALS. THAT'S THE WAY I AM ON THIS FLOOR. I'M NOT "BAMANITIOUS," BUT I MAY AS WELL BE. YOU THINK I'M DUMB ENOUGH, CRAZY ENOUGH TO THINK THAT A BUNCH OF WHITE PEOPLE ARE GOING TO LISTEN TO ME AND PAY ATTENTION ON SOMETHING THAT THEY THINK IS IMPORTANT TO WHITE PEOPLE? WHY, I SHOULDN'T EVEN BE DEALING WITH WHITE FOLKS' MESS, IS WHAT WE CALL IT, BUT YOU ALL CALL IT WHITE FOLKS' BUSINESS. WELL, THE CONSTITUTION THAT YOUR WHITE PEOPLE PUT TOGETHER OUGHT TO BE YOU WHITE FOLKS' BUSINESS AND IT OUGHT TO MEAN SOMETHING TO YOU. AND YOU OUGHT TO SHOW SOME RESPECT FOR IT IF YOU WANT OTHERS TO RESPECT IT. AND YOU SHOULD NOT JUST RESPECT IT IN THE BREACH OF IT. YOU SHOULD HONOR IT. YOU SHOULD LIONIZE IT. IT'S KNOWN AS THE ORGANIC LAW, THAT ON WHICH ALL OTHER LAW IS BASED AND FROM WHICH OTHER LAWS FLOW. AND YOU TAKE SOMETHING AS NONSENSICAL AS THIS AND PUT IT OUT THERE FOR THE PUBLIC. DO IT. YOU'RE GOING TO DO IT ANYWAY, BUT I WANT TO HAVE SEPARATED MYSELF.. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...FROM YOU. THERE WAS A SITUATION, A BIBLICAL SITUATION, AND PEOPLE WERE DOING EVIL THINGS. AND SOME OLD PROPHET DIDN'T WANT THEM TO KEEP DOING IT. SO, WHAT HE TOLD THEM, SEPARATE

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

YOURSELVES AND COME OVER HERE WITH ME. AND A GROUP FROM THE HOUSE OF LEVI DID SO. AND THEY BECAME THE LEVITES OR THE PRIESTS. YOU HAVE TO SEPARATE YOURSELF FROM THE FOOLISHNESS AND THAT'S WHAT I INTEND TO DO. BUT DO WHATEVER YOU WANT TO DO, BECAUSE YOU'RE GOING TO DO IT ANYWAY. PUT IT ON OUT THERE. AND I WANT TO SEE WHAT THE PUBLIC'S REACTION IS WHEN THEY SAY, THESE PEOPLE SAY THAT PEOPLE OUGHT TO HOLD OFFICE WHO ARE 18 YEARS OLD? WHY, MY 18-YEAR-OLD CHILD, UH-UH. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I KNOW IT'S THE THIRD TIME AND I KNOW EVERYBODY'S BREATHING A SIGH OF RELIEF; BUT IF THEY PUT SOMETHING ELSE UP THERE, I'M GOING TO SPEAK AGAIN. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR CHAMBERS. SENATOR BLOOMFIELD, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. COLLEAGUES, I REALLY DON'T KNOW WHAT TO SAY THAT HASN'T BEEN SAID, SO I'LL NOT DWELL ON THIS A LOT LONGER. SENATOR SCHUMACHER PUT UP AN AMENDMENT TO TRY TO HELP THIS BILL THAT IS FLAWED. IN MY MIND, IT'S VERY FLAWED. BUT WE'LL SEE WHERE THAT GOES. FROM WHAT I SAW ON THE BRACKET MOTION, I ASSUME WE WILL TURN DOWN THE KNOWLEDGE OF SENATOR SCHUMACHER AND SENATOR CHAMBERS AND RAM FORWARD WITH THIS. AND IT WILL PROBABLY FACE, AT SOME POINT, QUESTIONS IN THE SUPREME COURT. I DON'T PRETEND TO BE A LEARNED MAN. I MADE IT THROUGH HIGH SCHOOL. IF I'D HAD TO GO TWO MORE WEEKS, I MIGHT NOT HAVE MADE IT. I DETESTED SCHOOL. I CERTAINLY DIDN'T GO TO CREIGHTON. I DIDN'T GO TO LAW SCHOOL. WE HAVE TWO DISTINGUISHED SENATORS BACK THERE WHO BOTH EARNED A LAW DEGREE. WE HAVE SENATOR LARSON BACK THERE WHO HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO GO TO SCHOOL. I DON'T BELIEVE HE EARNED A LAW DEGREE, BUT PERHAPS HE DID. BUT WHEN IT COMES TO MATTERS OF LAW, I'M MORE INCLINED TO LISTEN TO PEOPLE THAT HAVE GONE TO LAW SCHOOL. I DON'T KNOW. THE BODY'S GOING TO DO WHAT IT'S GOING TO DO. I'M GOING TO VOTE FOR SENATOR SCHUMACHER'S AMENDMENT. I'M STILL CERTAINLY GOING TO VOTE AGAINST LR26, AND I WONDER IF SENATOR SCHUMACHER WOULD YIELD TO A QUESTION. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: SENATOR SCHUMACHER, WILL YOU YIELD? [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: YES, I WILL. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: SENATOR SCHUMACHER, DO YOU HAVE ANYTHING ELSE YOU'D LIKE TO SAY ON THIS AT THIS TIME? [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: NOT AT THIS TIME. I ASSUME I'VE GOT A COUPLE WORDS AT CLOSING, BUT THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR OFFERING. [LR26CA]

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: THANK YOU, SENATOR SCHUMACHER. I YIELD THE REMAINDER OF MY TIME TO SENATOR CHAMBERS. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: SENATOR CHAMBERS, 2:50. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, SENATOR BLOOMFIELD SAID IF HE'D GONE TO SCHOOL TWO MORE WEEKS HE MAY NOT HAVE MADE IT. IF I HAD NOT BEEN GIVEN A HALF CREDIT FOR HAVING PLAYED FOOTBALL, I WOULDN'T HAVE GRADUATED FROM HIGH SCHOOL ON TIME. I WENT TO TECH HIGH SCHOOL, WHICH WAS CONSIDERED A DUMB SCHOOL BECAUSE IT WAS FOR TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL. MY COURSES WOULD RUN SOMETIMES FOR A SEMESTER, GYM, STUDY HALL, LUNCHROOM, ART, BECAUSE THOSE PEOPLE DIDN'T CARE WHETHER I FINISHED SCHOOL OR NOT. SO I WOULDN'T HAVE GRADUATED ON TIME, BUT THAT DIDN'T MEAN MY MIND WASN'T FUNCTIONING. A GUY CAME TO THE SCHOOL TO TRY TO GET PEOPLE TO GO TO CREIGHTON AND I LIKED WHAT HE SAID. AND IT WAS WITHIN WALKING DISTANCE OF MY HOUSE, SO I DECIDED I WOULD GO UP THERE AND TAKE THEIR ENTRANCE EXAMINATION. REMEMBER, I WENT TO A DUMB SCHOOL. I WOULDN'T HAVE GRADUATED IF I HADN'T GOTTEN A HALF A CREDIT FOR PLAYING FOOTBALL. AND I SCORED SO HIGH ON THE ENTRANCE EXAM I WAS PUT IN WHAT'S CALLED HONORS ENGLISH AND PEOPLE WERE AMAZED. FIRST OF ALL, BECAUSE I WAS BLACK. SECONDLY, BECAUSE I CAME FROM TECH HIGH SCHOOL. PEOPLE JUDGE THE BOOK BY ITS COVER AND THEY OFTEN MAKE A MISTAKE, ESPECIALLY WITH US. BUT THEY'RE IN A POSITION TO WALK ON US NO MATTER WHAT WE KNOW, WHAT WE CAN DO. BUT WHAT I FEEL AN OBLIGATION TO DO, EVEN THOUGH I OFTEN SAY DISPARAGINGLY, IT'S YOUR CONSTITUTION AND ALL THE REST, I'M A PART OF THIS LEGISLATURE. I'M HERE VOLUNTARILY. I WANT THE WORK THAT COMES FROM US TO REACH A CERTAIN LEVEL OF EXCELLENCE. AND IF I CAN'T PUSH US TO THAT LEVEL, I WANT TO SEPARATE MYSELF FROM THE INFERIOR WORK THAT'S BEING DONE. I'M NOT GOING TO TALK LONG ON EVERY BILL. WE HAD BILLS... [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...THAT CAME THROUGH HERE WHERE I SAID NEXT TO NOTHING, BECAUSE IT DIDN'T MAKE ME ANY DIFFERENCE ONE WAY OR THE OTHER, EVEN IF I SOMEWHAT DISAGREED WITH IT. I WAS IN THE LORAN SCHMIT MODE: IT DOESN'T HELP ANYBODY, IT DOESN'T HURT ANYBODY, IT DOESN'T COST ANYTHING, IT DOESN'T DO ANYTHING, SO THEY CAN HAVE IT. BUT WHEN IT COMES TO SOMETHING THAT PERTAINS TO THE CONSTITUTION--AND IN MY ABSENCE THEY'VE PUT FISHING, TRAPPING, AND HUNTING INTO THE CONSTITUTION--THEY NEED SOMEBODY TO WATCH OVER THEM IN THIS LEGISLATURE. AS SOON AS I LEFT, THEY GOT THAT IN WHICH THEY COULDN'T GET IT IN FOR SEVERAL YEARS. AND HOW HAS IT ENHANCED THE CONSTITUTION? NOT ONE WHIT. IT DEMEANED IT, IT DEGRADED IT, IT POLLUTED IT. SO WHENEVER SOMETHING PERTAINS TO THE CONSTITUTION, I'M GOING TO DO WHAT I CAN TO KEEP IT IN THE FORM THAT IT OUGHT TO BE BASED ON MY UNDERSTANDING AND MY PERCEPTION. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR BLOOMFIELD, SENATOR SCHUMACHER, AND SENATOR CHAMBERS. SENATOR SEILER, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SEILER: MR. SPEAKER, MEMBERS OF THE UNICAMERAL, I THINK SENATOR SCHUMACHER HAS DONE A GOOD JOB OF PULLING THOSE SEGMENTS APART FOR A DEMONSTRATION OF WHAT DIFFERENT CHARACTERISTICS ARE IN THIS BILL. I DON'T THINK EVEN WITH HIS AMENDMENT SOLVES THE PROBLEM. LET ME TELL YOU A LITTLE HISTORY. TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO I DON'T THINK THERE'S ANY DOUBT YOU COULD THROW FIVE DIFFERENT SUBJECTS TOGETHER AND A SUPREME COURT WOULD FIND A WAY AROUND IT. STARTING ABOUT FIVE YEARS AGO, THEY STARTED TIGHTENING UP THOSE RULES EVERY TIME THEY GOT A CHANCE. AND THEY'VE HAD ABOUT THREE OR FOUR, MAYBE FIVE CASES IN THE LAST FIVE OR SIX YEARS THAT TIGHTEN THOSE RULES UP. AND EVEN WITH SENATOR SCHUMACHER'S AMENDMENT, I THINK, IT'S STILL HIGHLY SUSPECT THAT THIS BILL WOULD RECEIVE THE BACKHAND OF THE CURRENT SUPREME COURT. SO IT'S BEEN SUGGESTED THEY'RE GOING TO CLEAN IT UP BETWEEN THE GENERAL AND SELECT AND I'M NOT HERE TO TALK ABOUT THAT. THAT'S UP TO THE PEOPLE THAT ARE RUNNING THIS CAMPAIGN FOR THIS BILL. BUT I JUST WANTED TO REMIND YOU THAT I AGREE WITH SENATOR SCHUMACHER, BUT I DON'T THINK HIS FLOOR AMENDMENT ACTUALLY SOLVES THE PROBLEM. THANK YOU. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: THANK YOU, SENATOR SEILER. SENATOR LARSON, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

SENATOR LARSON: QUESTION. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: QUESTION HAS BEEN CALLED. DO I SEE FIVE HANDS? I DO SEE FIVE HANDS. THE QUESTION BEFORE US IS, SHALL DEBATE CEASE? ALL THOSE IN FAVOR VOTE AYE; OPPOSED, NAY. PLEASE RECORD, MR. CLERK. [LR26CA]

ASSISTANT CLERK: 25 AYES, 1 NAY TO CEASE DEBATE, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: DEBATE DOES CEASE. SENATOR SCHUMACHER, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE ON YOUR AMENDMENT. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE BODY. I THINK SENATOR SEILER'S ANALYSIS IS GOOD. THIS LANGUAGE IN THIS WAY IS PROBLEMATIC. WE EVEN HAVE AN ADMISSION THAT THE RESIDENCY THING IS A FISH OF A DIFFERENT COLOR IN THIS BASKET. AND WHAT FA83 DOES IS TRIES TO MAXIMIZE THE CHANCE THAT IF WE'RE GOING TO DO THIS LANGUAGE, IT SURVIVES IN THE SUPREME COURT. NOBODY CAN COMPLETELY CALCULATE THE ODDS OF WHAT THE COURT'S GOING TO DO, THAT'S BECAUSE WE HAVE COURTS. BUT YOU CAN KIND OF READ HINTS FROM WHAT THEY'VE SAID IN THE PAST, AND SENATOR SEILER ACCURATELY SUMMARIZES THOSE HINTS. AND WHEN IT COMES TO SINGLE SUBJECT, THEY WANT FREEDOM OF CHOICE. NOW IF WE PASS THIS AMENDMENT, I THINK IT PUTS THE PRESENT LANGUAGE IN AS GOOD A POSITION AS IT'S GOING TO BE. IF SENATOR MORFELD OR SOMEBODY ELSE STUDIES A WAY AND COMES OUT WITH DIFFERENT LANGUAGE, WE'VE STILL GOT THEY CAN OFFER AN AMENDMENT ON SELECT FILE. I'M NOT GOING TO OFFER ANY MORE AMENDMENTS. BUT IF THEY THINK THAT THEY'VE GOT A BETTER WAY TO PACKAGE THIS, THEY CAN SURE COME UP WITH AN AMENDMENT ON SELECT FILE AND WE'LL REVIEW IT. FOR RIGHT NOW, I'VE DONE MY DUTY AS A SENATOR AND A LAWYER AND PUT A SUGGESTION ON THE TABLE THAT MAXIMIZES THE CHANCE OF THIS THING SURVIVING SCRUTINY. IT MAY STILL FAIL, BUT AT LEAST I'VE DONE MY JOB. NOW YOU CAN DO YOURS. THANK YOU. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: YOU'VE HEARD THE CLOSING ON FA83. THE QUESTION IS, SHOULD FA83 PASS? ALL THOSE IN FAVOR VOTE AYE; OPPOSED, NAY. THERE'S BEEN A REQUEST TO PLACE THE HOUSE UNDER CALL. THE QUESTION IS, SHALL THE HOUSE GO UNDER CALL? THOSE IN FAVOR, AYE; OPPOSED, NAY. RECORD, MR. CLERK. [LR26CA]

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

ASSISTANT CLERK: 35 AYES, 0 NAYS TO GO UNDER CALL, MR. PRESIDENT.
[LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: HOUSE IS UNDER CALL. SENATORS, PLEASE RECORD YOUR PRESENCE. THOSE UNEXCUSED SENATORS OUTSIDE THE CHAMBER RETURN TO THE CHAMBER AND RECORD YOUR PRESENCE. ALL UNAUTHORIZED PERSONNEL PLEASE LEAVE THE FLOOR. THE HOUSE IS UNDER CALL. SENATOR SULLIVAN, WOULD YOU CHECK IN FOR ME, PLEASE? THANK YOU. SENATOR KEN HAAR, SENATOR MELLO, SENATOR JOHNSON, SENATOR GARRETT, PLEASE RETURN TO THE CHAMBER. THE HOUSE IS UNDER CALL. SENATORS KEN HAAR, MELLO, AND GARRETT, PLEASE RETURN TO THE CHAMBER. THE HOUSE IS UNDER CALL. SENATOR SCHUMACHER...SENATOR HAAR IS JUST COMING INTO THE CHAMBER NOW, SO WE'RE ALL PRESENT OR ACCOUNTED FOR. HOW WOULD YOU LIKE TO PROCEED? WE STARTED A MACHINE VOTE. WE CAN ACCEPT CALL-INS OR ROLL CALL. YES. OKAY, REGULAR ORDER. LOTS OF CHOICES, SENATOR. THERE'S BEEN A REQUEST FOR A ROLL CALL VOTE IN REGULAR ORDER. MR. CLERK. [LR26CA]

ASSISTANT CLERK: (ROLL CALL VOTE TAKEN, LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGES 449-450.) THE VOTE IS 17 AYES, 21 NAYS ON THE ADOPTION OF SENATOR SCHUMACHER'S AMENDMENT. [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: THE ADOPTION FAILS. RAISE THE CALL. ITEMS FOR THE RECORD, MR. CLERK. [LR26CA]

ASSISTANT CLERK: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. YOUR COMMITTEE ON ENROLLMENT AND REVIEW REPORTS LB471, LB270 AND LB131 TO SELECT FILE. YOUR COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY REPORTS LB327 AND LB846 TO GENERAL FILE WITH AMENDMENTS. YOUR COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION REPORTS LB735, LB785, LB811, LB814, LB929 TO GENERAL FILE AND LB880 TO GENERAL FILE WITH AMENDMENTS. YOUR COMMITTEE ON ENROLLMENT AND REVIEW REPORTS LB47 AND LB190 AS CORRECTLY ENGROSSED. NEW RESOLUTION: LR426 BY SENATOR MELLO AND OTHERS; THAT WILL BE LAID OVER. YOUR COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY REPORTS ON CONFIRMATION REPORTS. SENATOR LINDSTROM, ON BEHALF OF THE TRIBAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE, HAS CHOSEN LB1104 AS PRIORITY BILL. I HAVE NOTICE OF COMMITTEE HEARING FROM THE GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE AND THE RETIREMENT SYSTEMS COMMITTEE. NAME ADDS: SENATOR JOHNSON AND SENATOR WATERMEIER TO LB276; SENATOR JOHNSON TO LB886 AND LB952; SENATOR FOX TO LB1009; SENATOR LARSON TO LR35; SENATOR WILLIAMS TO LB907; SENATOR WATERMEIER TO LB897 AND

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 28, 2016

LB915; SENATOR BAKER TO LR422; SENATOR COOK TO LB947; AND SENATORS MORFELD AND HANSEN TO LR26CA. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGES 450-464.) [LB471 LB270 LB131 LB327 LB846 LB735 LB785 LB811 LB814 LB929 LB880 LB47 LB190 LR426 LB1104 LB276 LB886 LB952 LB1009 LR35 LB907 LB897 LB915 LR422 LB947 LR26CA]

FINALLY, A PRIORITY MOTION. SENATOR SULLIVAN WOULD MOVE TO ADJOURN UNTIL MONDAY MORNING, FEBRUARY 1, 2016, AT 10:00 A.M.

SENATOR KRIST: YOU'VE HEARD THE MOTION. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR, AYE. OPPOSED, NAY. WE ARE ADJOURNED UNTIL MONDAY MORNING AT 10:00.