

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

April 5, 2004 LB 391

age of majority. And so there are some things in there. And because of those safeguards, it's not as important for us to write those in our state statute, because it would have to be determined on a case-by-case basis, as the courts are equipped to do. So there are some things that I think are drafted appropriately in the committee amendment that reflect the rules and regulations as well as the procedures of the courts. And I think that's probably where you're going to find that there are some things that probably give some comfort in some areas that may not be there at this time. The issue that Senator Bourne brings up I think is important. But I think you need to realize that it's in the context of guardianship, and again recognize that we are debating this amendment on child support. But if we're going to go into the global, I guess I have to too, to direct the discussion. Guardianship is what Senator Bourne is referring to. The services that that constituent of his would have would continue to go on beyond the age of majority. And that's going to be governed by federal law, and there's going to be some different provisions under federal law that are going to ensure that individuals are going to continue to receive services. And so when we go through some of these issues, we'll do...I'll do my best to make sure that the information is there. Senator Bourne is absolutely correct that if we do change the guardianship date, that would change the date on which the parents would seek to have guardianship from the courts for an individual beyond the age of majority. So yeah, if we lower the age of majority to 18, that means they have to go sooner. However, that does not take away that individual's services; it just refers to who has guardianship over that individual. If I can also go back, I think Senator Schimek would have asked some questions, but didn't have time on her time to go there with the state wards discussion. The way that the bill is drafted, an individual will continue to receive services through the age of 18 or graduation. So in the event that an individual is a ward of the state and is going to go through graduation--maybe they're 18 years old but still a senior in high school--they would continue to receive the services under the law. They would continue as a school to receive those services as well for that individual. And then as they would graduate, the individual would then become eligible for the former ward program, if they were seeking to continue to enroll in higher