

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

April 5, 2004

LB 391

ready to answer questions. I do appreciate Senator Engel's questions, and specifically with the amendment before us, it does clarify that the changes in the area of child support are not retroactive, they do not apply to any existing decree, and those will be continued to be enforced as if the law had never changed. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Erdman. Senator Schimek, on the Erdman amendment to the committee amendments.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members. Senator Chambers, I feel thoroughly chastised. And I admit that you're right. I could have taken the time to read through this bill instead of saying I was too busy to read this amendment and this bill. But anyway, I turn my light on for several reasons, first of all in response to Senator Jensen's concern about gambling, and that is a legitimate concern. And I do know there was controversy over, I believe it was, the Winnebago casino over in Iowa, because Iowa didn't have the foresight to set an age limit over there, and that is something that we could and should do if we ever get to that point in Nebraska, is set the age limit, and I certainly wouldn't be in favor of age 18. But unless you do something specific, then the age of majority does become the norm. I asked Senator Erdman a little while ago about the election law portion of this and, as far as I can see, there would be no problem with the part in here about election law, and that's the only thing that I can see right off the top of my head that pertains to Government Committee business. I think that 18-year-olds should be allowed to run for office, and you know all the arguments and all the reasons, so I would have no problem with that. And I'm wondering if there are other portions of the amendment that other committees would have no objection to. I might go one step further than Senator Chambers and say that if we can find some noncontroversial portions of the amendment, that we could adopt those. But I think that at least for now we've got some pretty controversial things in here and some pretty serious things in here, and maybe we ought to whittle this amendment down if we're going to adopt it. That's really the only reason I turned on my light, is to say that I think there could be some...something we could do this year and then either have some interim studies regarding these other