

May 4, 1989

LB 769

her some additional support, and when that same young lady gets to be 21-years of age there are those who say she shouldn't even be allowed to make a decision as to whether or not she wants to bet on a football game or a basketball game or even put a quarter in a slot machine. You know there are some times the rational on this body...floor doesn't make much sense. So I'll support this amendment, then I'm ready to read the bill, I'm ready to read the bill. I want to remind you again I don't know how good the language is, and the lawyers around here say it's not good...

PRESIDENT: One minute.

SENATOR SCHMIT: ...but it's good enough for the Eighth Circuit Court, they've already approved it. Now, if that's wrong, then I'd like to have someone tell me it's wrong. But, as I understand, as it has been explained to me, the language is word-for-word the Minnesota law, and that has already been approved by the Eighth Circuit Court. So that ought to put to rest all of the allegations about the sloppy language, the poor draftsmanship, the bad definitions and the rest of it. I think that we can argue it, we'll continue, got plenty of time. But there is no way you can say it hasn't been considered sufficiently clear by the court, because it has been. And there are not very many bills on this floor that we pass that have already had approval of the court.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Ashford, please, followed by Senator Smith. Senator Smith, would you like to speak now, followed by Senator Nelson, Senator Labeledz and Senator Chambers. Senator Smith. Oh, all right, Senator Nelson, please.

SENATOR NELSON: Question of Senator Labeledz, please.

PRESIDENT: Senator Labeledz, please.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Yes, Senator.

SENATOR NELSON: Senator Labeledz, accepting that I know that you're somewhat carrying through the wishes of an organization, and that happens on every bill that we pass here, whether it's NRD or education, whatever, and so on and so forth. But bearing what Senator Ashford has brought to us from yesterday and from the bill and so on, on the books, is there really that much difference now that we have to repeal that section and that law