

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

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

[LB19 LB53 LB83 LB188 LB295 LB311 LB328 LB344 LB378 LB400A LB400 LB472 LB567
LB676 LB684 LB698 LB700 LB703 LB721 LB729 LB758 LB770 LB778 LB798 LB818
LB823 LB830 LB840 LB851 LB855 LB857 LB864 LB865 LB894 LB906 LB910 LB919
LB962 LB963 LB970 LB983 LB1002 LB1009 LB1032 LB1033 LB1042 LB1056 LB1059
LB1069 LB1086 LB1092 LB1093 LB1105 LB1109 LR26CA LR35 LR394CA LR399CA
LR437 LR438]

PRESIDENT FOLEY PRESIDING

PRESIDENT FOLEY: GOOD MORNING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. WELCOME TO THE GEORGE W. NORRIS LEGISLATIVE CHAMBER FOR THE TWENTY-SEVENTH DAY OF THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTH LEGISLATURE, SECOND SESSION. OUR CHAPLAIN FOR TODAY IS REVEREND MICHAEL THOMPSON OF THE NEW LIFE BAPTIST CHURCH IN BELLEVUE, NEBRASKA, LOCATED IN SENATOR CRAWFORD'S DISTRICT. PLEASE RISE.

REVEREND THOMPSON: (PRAYER OFFERED.)

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, REVEREND THOMPSON. I CALL TO ORDER THE TWENTY-SEVENTH DAY OF THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTH LEGISLATURE, SECOND SESSION. SENATORS, PLEASE RECORD YOUR PRESENCE. ROLL CALL. MR. CLERK, PLEASE RECORD.

CLERK: I HAVE A QUORUM PRESENT, MR. PRESIDENT.

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, MR. CLERK. ARE THERE ANY CORRECTIONS FOR THE JOURNAL?

CLERK: I HAVE NO CORRECTIONS, MR. PRESIDENT.

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, MR. CLERK. ARE THERE ANY MESSAGES, REPORTS, OR ANNOUNCEMENTS?

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, PRIORITY BILL DESIGNATIONS: SENATOR CHAMBERS, LB1056; SENATOR HADLEY, LB857. NEW RESOLUTION: LR437 BY SENATOR HADLEY. THAT WILL BE LAID OVER. I HAVE AN ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OPINION ADDRESSED TO SENATOR McCOLLISTER TO BE INSERTED IN THE JOURNAL (RE LB851). AND, MR. PRESIDENT,...

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

PRESIDENT FOLEY: EXCUSE ME, MR. CLERK. MEMBERS, PLEASE COME TO ORDER.

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, COMMUNICATION RECEIVED FROM THE STATE OF TENNESSEE. THAT WILL BE ACKNOWLEDGED. THAT'S ALL THAT I HAVE, MR. PRESIDENT. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGES 577-584.) [LB1056 LB857 LR437 LB851]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, MR. CLERK. WE'LL NOW PROCEED TO THE FIRST ITEM ON THE AGENDA, LEGISLATIVE CONFIRMATION REPORTS. MR. CLERK.

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, THE BANKING, COMMERCE AND INSURANCE COMMITTEE REPORTS ON THE APPOINTMENT OF PATRICK BOOTH TO THE EXCHANGE STAKEHOLDER COMMISSION. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGE 540.)

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, MR. CLERK. SENATOR SCHEER, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON THE CONFIRMATION REPORT.

SENATOR SCHEER: THANK YOU, MR. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR. I'D LIKE TO PREFACE, I HAVE THREE NOMINATIONS HERE AND IT IS A SORT OF A STRANGE EVENT BECAUSE THERE IS A BILL PENDING IN FRONT OF US, LB770, THAT IF THAT WERE TO BE ENACTED, THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THAT WOULD BE THE SAME EFFECTIVE DATE AS THESE REAPPOINTMENTS AND THE BILL ESSENTIALLY REMOVES THE COMMISSION THAT THEY'RE BEING REAPPOINTED TO. SO CHANCES ARE THESE APPOINTMENTS WILL NEVER TAKE PLACE, BUT WE DO NEED TO CONFIRM THEM IN CASE THE OTHER BILL DOES NOT GO FORWARD. SO HAVING SAID THAT, THE NEBRASKA EXCHANGE TRANSPARENCY ACT THAT WAS ENACTED IN 2011...COULD I HAVE A GAVEL, PLEASE? THANK YOU... WILL PROVIDE STATE-BASED RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION AND OPERATION OF THE INSURANCE EXCHANGE UNDER THE FEDERAL AFFORDABLE CARE ACT. THE COMMISSION HAS 11 MEMBERS: 2 EX OFFICIO, AND 9 APPOINTED BY THE GOVERNOR TO STAGGERED TERMS. THE APPOINTED MEMBERS ARE: FOUR MEMBERS THAT REPRESENT CONSUMERS; ONE MEMBER WHO REPRESENTS SMALL BUSINESS; TWO MEMBERS WHO REPRESENT HEALTHCARE PROVIDERS; ONE MEMBER WHO REPRESENTS HEALTH INSURANCE CARRIERS; AND ONE MEMBER WHO REPRESENTS HEALTH INSURANCE AGENTS. THE TERM OF THE THREE MEMBERS EXPIRE ON JUNE 30 AND THE GOVERNOR HAS REAPPOINTED THOSE THREE INDIVIDUALS. THE FIRST APPOINTEE IS PATRICK BOOTH OF AMES, NEBRASKA. HE IS PRESIDENT/CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE FREMONT AREA MEDICAL CENTER. ON THE COMMISSION HE REPRESENTS

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

THE INTERESTS OF HEALTHCARE PROVIDERS. I WOULD REQUEST THE CONFIRMATION OF MR. BOOTH. THANK YOU, MR. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR.
[LB770]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR SCHEER. DEBATE IS NOW OPEN ON THE FIRST OF THREE CONFIRMATION REPORTS FROM THE BANKING, COMMERCE AND INSURANCE COMMITTEE. SEEING NO MEMBERS WISHING TO SPEAK, SENATOR SCHEER IS RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE, AND HE WAIVES CLOSE. THE QUESTION IS THE ADOPTION OF THE FIRST OF THREE CONFIRMATION REPORTS FROM THE BANKING, COMMERCE AND INSURANCE COMMITTEE. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR VOTE AYE; THOSE OPPOSED VOTE NAY. HAVE YOU ALL VOTED WHO CARE TO? RECORD PLEASE, MR. CLERK.

CLERK: (RECORD VOTE, LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL 584.) 31 AYES, 0 NAYS ON ADOPTION OF THE CONFIRMATION REPORT.

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THE CONFIRMATION REPORT IS ADOPTED. MR. CLERK.

CLERK: A SECOND REPORT REGARDING THE APPOINTMENT OF SHARI FLOWERS TO THE EXCHANGE STAKEHOLDER COMMISSION. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGE 541.)

PRESIDENT FOLEY: SENATOR SCHEER, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON THE SECOND CONFIRMATION REPORT.

SENATOR SCHEER: THANK YOU AGAIN, MR. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR. AGAIN, THIS IS A APPOINTMENT TO THE NEBRASKA EXCHANGE STAKEHOLDER COMMISSION. MS. FLOWERS IS FROM OMAHA, NEBRASKA. SHE IS VICE PRESIDENT AND CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER OF COMPLIANCE AND ETHICS FOR THE BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF NEBRASKA ON THE COMMISSION. AND SHE REPRESENTS THE INTERESTS OF HEALTH INSURANCE CARRIERS ON THIS COMMISSION. THE COMMITTEE WOULD URGE YOUR REAPPOINTMENT OF MS. FLOWERS.

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR SCHEER. (VISITORS AND DOCTOR OF THE DAY INTRODUCED.) DEBATE IS NOW OPEN ON THE SECOND OF THREE CONFIRMATION REPORTS FROM THE BANKING, COMMERCE AND INSURANCE COMMITTEE. SEEING NO MEMBERS WISHING TO GO SPEAK, SENATOR SCHEER IS

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE. AND HE WAIVES CLOSE. AND THE QUESTION IS THE ADOPTION OF THE CONFIRMATION REPORT. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR VOTE AYE; THOSE OPPOSED VOTE NAY. HAVE YOU ALL VOTED WHO CARE TO? RECORD, MR. CLERK.

CLERK: (RECORD VOTE, LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGE 585.) 33 AYES, 0 NAYS ON ADOPTION OF THE REPORT.

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THE CONFIRMATION REPORT IS ADOPTED. MR. CLERK.

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, BANKING, COMMERCE AND INSURANCE COMMITTEE REPORTS ON THE APPOINTMENT OF ED RIEKER TO THE EXCHANGE STAKEHOLDER COMMISSION. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGE 541.)

PRESIDENT FOLEY: SENATOR SCHEER, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON THE CONFIRMATION REPORT.

SENATOR SCHEER: THANK YOU, ONE LAST TIME, MR. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR. AGAIN, THIS IS THE THIRD AND FINAL APPOINTMENT TO THE NEBRASKA EXCHANGE STAKEHOLDER COMMISSION THAT PROVIDES STATE-BASED RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION AND OPERATION OF AN INSURANCE EXCHANGE UNDER THE FEDERAL AFFORDABLE CARE ACT, THE LAST OF THE APPOINTMENTS. THE THIRD APPOINTEE...REAPPOINTEE IS EDWARD RIEKER OF NORTH PLATTE. HIS OCCUPATION IS MARKETING AND SALES FOR ALPHA AND ASSOCIATES, INC., AND W DESIGN ASSOCIATES, INC. ON THE COMMISSION HE REPRESENTS THE INTERESTS OF CONSUMERS. IT IS THE WISH AND SUGGESTION OF THE COMMITTEE THAT HIS REAPPOINTMENT BE CONFIRMED BY THE BODY. THANK YOU, MR. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR.

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR SCHEER. (VISITORS INTRODUCED.) DEBATE IS NOW OPEN ON THE THIRD OF THREE CONFIRMATION REPORTS FROM THE BANKING, COMMERCE AND INSURANCE COMMITTEE. SEEING NO MEMBERS WISHING TO SPEAK, SENATOR SCHEER IS RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE. AND HE WAIVES CLOSING. THE QUESTION IS THE ADOPTION OF THE CONFIRMATION REPORT FROM THE BANKING, COMMERCE AND INSURANCE COMMITTEE. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR VOTE AYE; THOSE OPPOSED VOTE NAY. HAVE YOU ALL VOTED? RECORD PLEASE, MR. CLERK.

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

CLERK: (RECORD VOTE, LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGES 585-586.) 35 AYES, 0 NAYS, MR. PRESIDENT, ON THE ADOPTION OF THE CONFIRMATION REPORT.

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THE CONFIRMATION REPORT IS ADOPTED. MR. CLERK.

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, THE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE REPORTS ON THE APPOINTMENT OF CHRISTOPHER KIRCHER AND LOWELL MINERT TO THE STATE FAIR BOARD. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGE 554.)

PRESIDENT FOLEY: SENATOR JOHNSON, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON THE CONFIRMATION REPORT.

SENATOR JOHNSON: THANK YOU, LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR. TODAY I RISE IN SUPPORT OF THIS NOMINATION OF MR. MINERT AND MR. KIRCHER. BOTH ARE RETURN CANDIDATES FOR THE STATE FAIR BOARD. STATE FAIR BOARD IS MADE UP OF SEVEN MEMBERS FROM LOCAL AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES: FOUR MEMBERS APPOINTED BY THE GOVERNOR AND TWO EX OFFICIO MEMBERS REPRESENTING THE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION AND NEBRASKA FFA. MR. MINERT AND HIS FAMILY OPERATE A RANCH, AN ANGUS SEEDSTOCK OPERATION NEAR DUNNING, NEBRASKA; IS A GRADUATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA WITH A B.S. IN AGRICULTURE. HE HAS BEEN ACTIVE IN 4-H AND SERVED ON HIS COUNTY FAIR BOARD. CHRISTOPHER KIRCHER--SECOND APPOINTMENT FOR HIM--HE'S PRESIDENT OF THE CONAGRA FOODS FOUNDATION AND PRESIDENT OF THEIR PUBLIC CORPORATE AFFAIRS. HE RECEIVED A B.S. DEGREE IN MARKETING. HIS LIST OF MEMBERSHIPS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP IN THE OMAHA AREA AND NEBRASKA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, AMONG A NUMBER OF OTHER BOARDS, ADVISORY COUNCIL AND HE HAS SERVED THEM WELL. BOTH MR. MINERT AND MR. KIRCHER APPEARED BEFORE THE COMMITTEE FOR THEIR CONFIRMATION HEARING ON FEBRUARY 9. IT WAS APPARENT THAT BOTH NOMINEES HAVE ENJOYED THEIR TIME ON THE FAIR BOARD AND BEEN ABLE TO ADD SIGNIFICANT VALUE TO ITS PROGRESS. THE COMMITTEE VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO RECOMMEND BOTH LOWELL MINERT AND CHRISTOPHER KIRCHER FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE NEBRASKA STATE FAIR BOARD AND I ASK FOR A GREEN VOTE.

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR JOHNSON. DEBATE IS NOW OPEN ON THE CONFIRMATION REPORT FROM THE AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE. SEEING NO MEMBERS WISHING TO SPEAK, SENATOR JOHNSON WAIVES CLOSE. AND THE QUESTION IS THE ADOPTION OF THE CONFIRMATION REPORT FROM THE

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR VOTE AYE; THOSE OPPOSED VOTE NAY. RECORD PLEASE, MR. CLERK.

CLERK: (RECORD VOTE, LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGE 586) 30 AYES, 0 NAYS ON ADOPTION OF THE CONFIRMATION REPORT.

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THE CONFIRMATION REPORT IS ADOPTED. MR. CLERK.

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE REPORTS ON THREE APPOINTMENTS: ONE, SHELLY McQUILLAN TO THE CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION FUND BOARD; COURTNEY MILLER AND DOUGLAS WEINBERG TO THE DIRECTOR OF DIVISION OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES AND AS DIRECTOR OF DIVISION OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGE 564.)

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, MR. CLERK. SENATOR CAMPBELL, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON THE CONFIRMATION REPORT.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. MR. CLERK, I WILL START WITH SHELLY McQUILLAN BECAUSE I'M ASSUMING THESE WILL HAVE TO BE SEPARATE VOTES.

CLERK: SENATOR, THEY'RE PRESENTED TO ME AS ONE REPORT. SO UNLESS YOU PREFER THAT, WE WOULD TAKE BUT ONE VOTE ON THEM.

SENATOR CAMPBELL: EXCELLENT. I'LL GO THROUGH ALL THREE THEN. THANK YOU, MR. CLERK. COLLEAGUES, OUR FIRST APPOINTMENT THAT WE WANT TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT IS SHELLY McQUILLAN. SHELLY IS FROM OGALLALA AND THIS IS HER FIRST APPOINTMENT TO THE CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION FUND BOARD. SHE HAS A BACHELOR'S FROM CREIGHTON IN SOCIAL WORK AND SHE CURRENTLY SERVES AS A SOCIAL WORKER AT THE OGALLALA BANNER COUNTY COMMUNITY HOSPITAL. SHE IS A CASA VOLUNTEER, SHE SERVES ON THE TEAMMATES BOARD, AND SHE PREVIOUSLY LED THE OGALLALA YOUTH COMMITTEE. SHE WILL BE AN IMPORTANT VOICE FROM WESTERN NEBRASKA AND THE SIZE OF CITY OF OGALLALA. AND WE'RE REALLY PLEASED TO HAVE HER STEP FORWARD TO SERVE. COLLEAGUES, I WOULD REALLY APPRECIATE YOUR ATTENTION TO THE NEXT TWO APPOINTEES. MR. PRESIDENT, COULD I HAVE A GAVEL, PLEASE? COLLEAGUES, THE NEXT TWO APPOINTMENTS ARE NOT

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

JUST ON AN ADVISORY BOARD, BUT THEY ARE DIRECTORS FROM THE HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT. ON YOUR DESK IS THE OPENING STATEMENT GIVEN BY BOTH OF THOSE DIRECTORS TO THE HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE. AFTER LAST YEAR'S DISCUSSION ON THE APPOINTMENT OF A DIRECTOR TO THE HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE, I DECIDED THAT YOU NEEDED TO SEE WHAT THE DIRECTOR APPOINTEES WERE DISCUSSING WITH THE HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE. THE FIRST APPOINTMENT IS DOUG WEINBERG AND DOUG IS SERVING AS THE DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES. HE HAS A BACHELOR'S DEGREE FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN AT MADISON, HE HAS AN MBA AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, AND HE IS A CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT. HIS CAREER HAD TWO VERY DISTINCT COMPONENTS, AS YOU WILL SEE IN THE OPENING. THE FIRST PART INCLUDED VARIOUS FINANCE AND CORPORATE DEVELOPMENT ROLES IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY. AND THEN IN 2001 HE ENTERED INTO THE FIELD OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, SERVING AT CHILDREN'S HOME IN FLORIDA AND EVENTUALLY WITH THE INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SERVICES WHERE HE SERVED AS THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION. BEFORE HE CAME TO THE DEPARTMENT, HE WAS SERVING AS A PRIVATE CONSULTANT. IF YOU WOULD LOOK AT THE SECOND PAGE OF HIS, HE HAS LISTED HIS PRIORITIES FOR THE COMING YEAR. THEY ALSO REPRESENT SIGNIFICANT PRIORITIES FOR THE STATE OF NEBRASKA IN SERVING CHILDREN AND FAMILIES. OUR NEXT DESIGNEE IS COURTNEY MILLER. COURTNEY MILLER IS SERVING AS THE DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES FOR THE DEPARTMENT. MS. MILLER EARNED A BACHELOR'S DEGREE FROM BRIAR CLIFF UNIVERSITY IN SOCIAL WORK AND A MASTER'S DEGREE FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-OMAHA IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION. SHE BEGAN WITH THE IOWA DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES AND CAME TO NEBRASKA IN THE YEAR 2000 WITH AN EIGHT-YEAR TENURE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, WHICH I FIND MOST FASCINATING GIVEN OUR CONCENTRATION ON THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS. SHE THEN TRANSFERRED TO THE NEBRASKA STATE PAROLE AND MANAGED CRIMINAL BACKGROUND REQUESTS AND VERIFIED BACKGROUND INFORMATION. IN 2008 SHE WENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES IN THE DIVISION OF MEDICAID AND LONG-TERM CARE. AND MOST OF US KNOW MS. MILLER PREVIOUSLY ON HER SERVICE IN THE MEDICAID DIVISION. SHE HELD NUMEROUS POSITIONS IN THE MEDICAID DEPARTMENT UNTIL SHE WAS APPOINTED INTERIM DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES. IT WAS INTERESTING TO THE COMMITTEE--AND YOU WILL SEE IN HER OPENING STATEMENT--THAT SHE HELD NINE TOWN HALL STYLE FORUMS

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

WITH FAMILY, FRIENDS, PROVIDERS, AND ADVOCATES ACROSS THE STATE TO SEE WHAT THEY THOUGHT WAS CRITICAL. SHE HAS THREE PRIORITIES FOR THE COMING YEAR IN DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES. AT LEAST SHE HAS A NUMBER OF THEM, BUT THESE WERE HER THREE TOP ONES IN AN ANSWER TO SENATOR RIEPE. SHE LISTED: IMPROVEMENT IN CUSTOMER SERVICE; HOW TO BEST MOVE FORWARD WITH SERVICE TO PEOPLE WITH INTELLECTUAL DISABILITIES; AND THE ACCOUNTABILITY THAT IS GOING TO BE NECESSARY AND THE RELATIONSHIPS THAT HAVE TO BE BUILT. IT CERTAINLY WAS A UNANIMOUS VOTE BY THE COMMITTEE ON ALL THREE OF THESE APPOINTEES AND I HOPE YOU TAKE TIME TO READ, PARTICULARLY, THE DIRECTORS FROM HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES. AND WITH THAT, MR. PRESIDENT, I CONCLUDE MY COMMENTS.

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR CAMPBELL. DEBATE IS NOW OPEN ON THE CONFIRMATION REPORT. SEEING NO SENATORS WISHING TO SPEAK, SENATOR CAMPBELL, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE. AND SHE WAIVES CLOSE. THE QUESTION IS THE ADOPTION OF THE CONFIRMATION REPORT FROM THE HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR VOTE AYE; THOSE OPPOSED VOTE NAY. HAVE YOU ALL VOTED WHO CARE TO? RECORD PLEASE, MR. CLERK.

CLERK: (RECORD VOTE, LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGE 587.) 31 AYES, 0 NAYS ON THE ADOPTION OF THE REPORT.

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THE CONFIRMATION REPORT IS ADOPTED. SPEAKER HADLEY, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED FOR AN ANNOUNCEMENT.

SPEAKER HADLEY: MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE BODY, JUST A COUPLE, TWO OR THREE QUICK THINGS. A REMINDER, TOMORROW PRIOR TO ADJOURNMENT IS THE DEADLINE TO SUBMIT A LETTER TO ME REGARDING CONSIDERATION OF A BILL AS SPEAKER PRIORITY. FRIDAY, PRIOR TO ADJOURNMENT IS THE DEADLINE FOR SPEAKER AND COMMITTEE TO DESIGNATE THEIR SENATOR AND COMMITTEE PRIORITY BILLS. THESE DEADLINES ARE FIRM. ON MONDAY, AFTER I'VE HAD A CHANCE TO REVIEW ALL THE SPEAKER PRIORITY REQUESTS, I WILL ANNOUNCE MY SPEAKER PRIORITY BILL DESIGNATIONS. I AM PLANNING ON HAVING ANOTHER CONSENT CALENDAR BEFORE THE END OF THE SESSION, SO YOU CAN START SENDING LETTERS ON THAT TOMORROW. JUST AS A HEADS UP, THERE WILL BE FINAL READING TOMORROW AND WE WILL HAVE A NUMBER OF BILLS ON FINAL READING, SO

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

YOU MIGHT WANT TO ADJUST YOUR SCHEDULE ACCORDINGLY. AND LASTLY, IF YOU TURN OVER TODAY'S AGENDA, YOU SEE ON THE BACK A COMMON TOOL THAT WE USE HERE. AT 11:55 ON SELECT FILE, WE WILL GO TO ALL SELECT FILE BILLS THAT DO NOT HAVE AMENDMENTS TO CLEAR THE AGENDA ON THOSE. SO I JUST WANTED YOU TO MAKE SURE YOU TURN OVER AND READ THE BACK OF THE FILE. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT.

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER. RETURNING NOW TO THE AGENDA, SELECT FILE. MR. CLERK.

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, LR26CA, A RESOLUTION PROPOSED BY SENATOR LARSON. IT IS ON SELECT FILE. ENROLLMENT AND REVIEW AMENDMENTS HAVE BEEN ADOPTED. WHEN THE LEGISLATURE LEFT THE ISSUE YESTERDAY, SENATOR MORFELD HAD PRESENTED AM2043. MR. PRESIDENT, I DO HAVE A PRIORITY MOTION FILED. [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, MR. CLERK. BEFORE I PROCEED TO DEBATE ON THE BILL, SENATOR LARSON, WOULD YOU LIKE TO TAKE JUST ONE MINUTE JUST TO REFRESH US ON WHERE WE LEFT OFF? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: YEAH, THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. ESSENTIALLY, LR26CA, AS ORIGINALLY INTRODUCED, WOULD LOWER THE AGE TO SERVE IN ANY PUBLIC OFFICE TO 18 ACROSS THE STATE OF NEBRASKA. SENATOR MORFELD'S AM2043 TAKES AWAY THE SUPREME COURT JUSTICES OUT OF THAT, SO IT WOULD JUST BE ELECTED OFFICES. JUDGING BY CASE LAW, IT LOOKED LIKE THE SUPREME COURT JUSTICES WOULD HAVE CREATED A SECOND QUESTION ON THE BALLOT. AND WHAT AM2043 WORKS TO DO IS TO TAKE THAT SEPARATE QUESTION AWAY OR TAKE THAT SECOND QUESTION OUT AND TO WHERE IT WOULD BE A SINGLE QUESTION. SO I'M IN SUPPORT OF AM2043 MOVING FORWARD AND LR26CA TO GIVE EVERY INDIVIDUAL THE RIGHT TO PARTICIPATE IN THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR LARSON. (VISITORS INTRODUCED.) MR. CLERK. [LR26CA]

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, A PRIORITY MOTION: SENATOR CHAMBERS WOULD MOVE TO BRACKET THE BILL UNTIL APRIL 20, 2016. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

PRESIDENT FOLEY: SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO OPEN ON THE BRACKET MOTION. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. MR. PRESIDENT, ONCE AGAIN WE HAVE A BILL THAT IS BAD. WE ARE GOING TO GO BACK TO ANOTHER ONE THAT'S BAD BY THE SAME INTRODUCER ON GAMBLING AND FANTASY SPORTS. AND IF THE BODY WANTS TO CONTINUE TAKING ALL THIS TIME, I'M WILLING TO TAKE IT. I DON'T WANT TO JUST SAY THAT AND NOT DELIVER OR YOU WON'T BE ABLE TO TAKE SERIOUSLY ANYTHING I SAY. BUT I WILL CALL YOUR ATTENTION TO THE FACT THAT THIS IS THE TWENTY-SEVENTH DAY AND WE'RE MOVING TOWARD THE PERIOD IN THE SESSION THAT I ALWAYS RELISH. THAT'S WHEN WE DON'T HAVE MUCH TIME, BUT WE HAVE VERY SERIOUS ISSUES TO DEAL WITH. PEOPLE BECOME SOMEWHAT FRANTIC, THEN THAT BECOMES DESPERATION, THEN THEY ASK THAT QUESTION, WHAT MUST I DO TO BE SAVED? THE THING TO DO IS CONSIDER THE BEST USE OF TIME NOW. THIS IS A BAD BILL AND I INTEND TO OFFER MOTIONS TO HELP RUN OUT THE CLOCK. AND ALONG THE WAY WE'LL GET TEST VOTES AND IF THEY DON'T GET 33 VOTES, THEY CAN'T GET CLOTURE. BUT IF THEY WANT TO TAKE US THE FULL FOUR HOURS ON SELECT THEN TWO HOURS ON FINAL, I'M WILLING TO DO IT. I HAD WRITTEN A RHYME ABOUT THIS AND RATHER THAN REINVENT THE WHEEL BY GIVING ARGUMENTS, I'M GOING TO READ IT. IT'S TITLED, "LARSON'S FOLLIES FOLLOWERS." I PUT AT THE BEGINNING THE EXCERPT FROM AN ARTICLE TO DESCRIBE WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT. THE HEADLINE, AND IT'S FROM THE WORLD-HERALD, "MINIMUM AGE TO HOLD OFFICE COULD DROP TO 18." A MEASURE THAT WOULD ASK NEBRASKANS TO LOWER THE MINIMUM AGE FOR PUBLIC OFFICEHOLDERS TO 18 HAS ADVANCED, DESPITE CONCERNS ABOUT THE MEASURE'S CONSTITUTIONALITY AND WHETHER YOUNG PEOPLE ARE READY TO SERVE. INTRODUCED BY O'NEILL SENATOR TYSON LARSON, LR26CA MOVED FORWARD MONDAY TO SECOND-ROUND DEBATE ON A 27 TO 11 VOTE. EVEN IF YOU TOOK YOUR TRAINING AT OPS, YOU KNOW THAT 27 IS A FEWER NUMBER OF VOTES THAN 33. LARSON ARGUED THAT PEOPLE WHO ARE OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE SHOULD BE OLD ENOUGH TO RUN FOR OFFICE. AND HERE IS THE RHYME: AS SENATORS' SHORTSIGHTED VIEWS WERE AIRED, THEIR JUDGMENT WAS SHOWN TO BE QUITE IMPAIRED. OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE, THEY MOUTHED WILLY-NILLY, OLD ENOUGH TO SERVE; HOW SHALLOW AND SILLY. SUCH WAS THE SIREN SONG OF SENATOR LARSON, WHO LEADS THE IMPAIRED LIKE A HUCKSTERING PARSON. SIRENS WERE SEA NYMPHS WHO SO SWEETLY SANG, THEIR VOICES LURED SAILORS WHOSE SHIPS WITH A BANG SHATTERED ON ROCKS AND SANK NEATH GREAT WAVES, IMPRISONED FOREVER IN WATERY GRAVES. TO HIS SIREN SONG THE IMPAIRED ARE BEHOLDEN. WITH WHAT RESULT? THOSE LEMMINGS

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

DID EMBOLDEN THEIR LEADER, HIS LATEST SILLINESS TO DISCLOSE. WILL THEY ONCE AGAIN BE LED BY THE NOSE? WHAT IS HIS LATEST SILLINESS? LISTEN WELL. GIVING DUE CREDIT, HIS HYPNOTIC SPELL VICES THEIR MINDS AND BINDS WITH A FETTER SENATORS WHO ONE WOULD THINK SHOULD KNOW BETTER. LET ME NOT DILLYDALLY OVERLY LONG. IN SETTING FORTH THEIR LEADER'S SIREN SONG, HIS "SCHTICK" (SIC)--SPELLED S-C-H-T-I-C-K, I'M NOT DELIBERATELY MISPRONOUNCING STICK--HIS "SCHTICK" TO WHICH THE IMPAIRED TIP THEIR HAT: OLD ENOUGH FOR THIS, OLD ENOUGH FOR THAT. OLD ENOUGH FOR WAR, THEN DON'T KIDS DESERVE THE RIGHT IN ELECTIVE OFFICE TO SERVE? IF KIDS ARE OLD ENOUGH FOR OFFICE TO VOTE, THEY'RE OLD ENOUGH TO HOLD SUCH OFFICE, TAKE NOTE. LET THE IMPAIRED ON THIS COGITATE, KIDS WHO ARE OLD ENOUGH TO PROCREATE, NEVERTHELESS IN NEBRASKA ARE DENIED THE RIGHT OR THE PRIVILEGE TO DECIDE IF SUCH KIDS ARE BELOW A GIVEN AGE IN THE RITUAL OF MARRIAGE TO ENGAGE. DESPITE BEING OLD ENOUGH TO BE A MOTHER, SUCH KIDS NOT OLD ENOUGH TO DO THE OTHER. NOW, LET US SEE IF THE IMPAIRED SHALL HOLD FIRM, EVEN IF DOING SO CAUSES THEM TO SQUIRM. HARK, FOR THE SIRENS' SONG NO LONGER WAIT. SEE WHAT THEIR LEADER NOW PLOPS ON THEIR PLATE. THEN AN EXCERPT FROM THIS ARTICLE HEADLINE, "LAWMAKERS TOLD LOWER AGE FOR THOSE SERVING ALCOHOL UNWISE--SIXTEEN ON TAP AS LEGAL AGE FOR SERVING ALCOHOL". THEN--YOU COULD CALL THIS A SUBPARAGRAPH--"BILL IS OPPOSED BY MOTHER OF 18-YEAR-OLD DRIVER KILLED IN CRASH AFTER BEING SERVED BY 20-YEAR-OLD". PEER PRESSURE CAN LEAD TO UNWISE DECISION, SAYS FORMER SERVER. AMANDA HEIMAN BELIEVES ALLOWING 16-YEAR-OLDS TO SERVE ALCOHOL WOULD PUT THEM IN A VULNERABLE SITUATION WHERE THEY COULD FEEL PRESSURED TO FIT IN AND SERVE THEIR FRIENDS. SHE SHOULD KNOW. IN 2012, HEIMAN, THEN A 20-YEAR-OLD WAITRESS AT THE FIRE BARN SPORTS BAR AND GRILL IN WATERLOO, SERVED ALCOHOL TO 18-YEAR-OLD JACOB DICKMEYER, D-I-C-K-M-E-Y-E-R, AND ANOTHER UNDERAGE PERSON. SHE SUCCUMBED TO PEER PRESSURE FOR A BOY SHE HAD A CRUSH ON. HEIMAN WROTE THIS IN A LETTER SUBMITTED TO A COMMITTEE IN THE NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE. THE RESULT WAS FATAL. THAT NIGHT DICKMEYER CRASHED HIS CAR ON HIS WAY HOME AND DIED. MONDAY THE GENERAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE HEARD TESTIMONY ON LB1105, WHICH AMONG OTHER THINGS WOULD ALLOW ESTABLISHMENTS TO LET 16-YEAR-OLDERS SERVE ALCOHOL AS LONG AS THEY SERVE...THE SERVER HAS TAKEN STATE-APPROVED TRAINING. HEIMAN URGED LAWMAKERS TO INDEFINITELY POSTPONE THE BILL, SAYING THE CONSEQUENCES OF HER ACTIONS, QUOTE, ARE NEVER GOING TO LEAVE ME OR MY FRIEND'S FAMILY, UNQUOTE. QUOTE, I DIDN'T REALIZE ME TRYING TO FIT IN AND SERVE THEM A FEW BEERS WOULD EVENTUALLY LEAD ME INTO LOSING A FRIEND, HIS FAMILY

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

TO ENDURE THE MOST PAINFUL CONSEQUENCES OF LOSING A SON, AND ME HAVING TO VISIT MY BEST FRIEND AT A GRAVE SITE AND NOT AT HIS HOUSE, SHE WROTE. MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, YOUNG PEOPLE CAN BE INFLUENCED BY PEER PRESSURE, SOMETIMES WITH FATAL RESULTS. LET'S SAY THAT YOU LET AN 18-YEAR-OLD PERSON SERVE IN THE LEGISLATURE. I TOUCHED ON THIS THE OTHER DAY. LOBBYISTS PUT ON FUNCTIONS. LIQUOR IS SERVED. THAT SENATOR COULD NOT BE PRESENT. THERE ARE THINGS WHICH COMMON SENSE WOULD INDICATE TO THOSE WHO ARE THOUGHTFUL, WHO ARE MATURE REGARDLESS OF THEIR AGE, THAT PUTTING YOUNG PEOPLE IN SITUATIONS WHERE BAD JUDGMENT MAY BE EXPECTED IS NOT REALLY FAIR TO THE YOUNG PERSON. AND I THINK THE VERY ACT OF OUR SENDING SUCH A LAMEBRAIN NOTION TO THE PUBLIC TO VOTE ON REFLECTS NEGATIVELY ON THE LEGISLATURE. OUR JOB IS TO USE GOOD JUDGMENT AND DO THOSE THINGS WHICH THAT JUDGMENT WOULD DICTATE THAT WE DO. THAT DOESN'T MEAN WE ALL COME TO THE SAME CONCLUSION AND AGREE. BUT WE SHOULD AGREE THAT SOME MEASURES ARE VERY IMPORTANT AND WE SHOULD NOT SIMPLY SEND IT TO THE PUBLIC AND SAY, LET THEM VOTE. SOME THINGS SHOULD NOT BE LEFT TO A POPULARITY CONTEST OR AN OPINION POLL. WE ARE THE LAWMAKERS. WE ARE THE ONES WHO SHOULD BE THE PROTECTORS AND GUARDIANS OF THE CONSTITUTION. AND WE, BY OUR CONDUCT, OUGHT TO DEMONSTRATE WHAT IS EXPECTED OF PEOPLE IN OFFICE. [LR26CA LB1105]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I COULDN'T FINISH THE WHOLE RHYME THIS TIME AROUND BUT I'M GOING TO, BECAUSE IT MAKES SOME REFERENCES TO SENATOR LARSON AND THE WAY HE COMPORTS HIMSELF. AND HE CONSIDERS HIMSELF TO BE YOUNG. SO IS THAT TO BE THE EXAMPLE OF THE YOUNG PEOPLE WHO WOULD SERVE IN OFFICE? WE HAVE AN EXHIBIT A AMONG US. THIS BILL, HIGHLY UNCONSTITUTIONAL, WAS DEFENDED BY SENATOR LARSON AND OTHERS. AND THEN ONE OF THE PERSONS ON THEIR SIDE DECIDED TO LOOK AT SOME OF THE QUESTIONS RAISED AND NOW THEY WANT TO MODIFY IT. BUT EVEN IF THE MODIFICATIONS THEY'RE SUGGESTING AT THIS POINT WERE ADOPTED, THAT WOULDN'T BE SUFFICIENT. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR CHAMBERS. (VISITORS INTRODUCED.) DEBATE IS NOW OPEN ON LR26CA AND THE RELATED AMENDMENT AND MOTION. SENATOR MORFELD, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SENATOR MORFELD: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I OBVIOUSLY OPPOSE THE BRACKET MOTION AND I JUST WANT TO BRING TO YOUR ATTENTION THAT I DID FILE ONE AMENDMENT TO MY AMENDMENT AT THE REQUEST OF THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE. YOU CAN PULL IT UP ON YOUR COMPUTER; IT'S AM2179. AND IT'S JUST TAKING OUT, "SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS, OTHER THAN AGE, ESTABLISHED BY LAW," FOR GOVERNOR AND LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR. THIS IS SOMETHING THAT WE ATTACH TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL AND MAYBE ONE OR TWO OTHER OFFICES THAT REQUIRE THAT THERE BE CERTAIN OTHER QUALIFICATIONS. SO FOR INSTANCE, OUR ATTORNEY GENERAL MUST BE AN ATTORNEY AND THAT'S WHAT THAT LINE IS GENERALLY MEANT FOR. IT WAS SOMETHING THAT WE MISSED WITH BILL DRAFTERS. AND I AGREE WITH THE GOVERNOR'S P-R-O OFFICE IN THE SENSE THAT WE SHOULD TAKE THAT OUT FOR LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR AND GOVERNOR. SO THAT IS AM2179 AND THAT SHOULD BE ON YOUR COMPUTER. I WOULD URGE YOUR ADOPTION OF THAT AMENDMENT WHEN THE TIME COMES. IT SOUNDS LIKE WE'LL BE DEBATING THIS FOR A WHILE. THE ONLY OTHER THING THAT I'LL SAY IS THAT OLD PEOPLE CAN ALSO BE SUBJECT TO PEER PRESSURE AS WELL; I'VE SEEN IT HAPPEN IN THIS BODY. AND SO THAT IS NOT SOMETHING THAT IS EXCLUSIVE TO YOUNGER INDIVIDUALS. WITH THAT BEING SAID, I URGE YOUR SUPPORT OF THE AMENDMENT AND THE UNDERLYING AMENDMENT AND URGE YOU TO OPPOSE THE BRACKET MOTION. THANK YOU. [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR MORFELD. SENATOR LARSON, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I HAVE NO DOUBT THAT SENATOR CHAMBERS WILL WANT TO TAKE ALL THE TIME HE CAN ON LR26CA. AND IN REALITY, IT'S PROBABLY MORE SOMETHING THE...WHAT IS ON THE NEXT BILL IN LB970. IT'S A COMMON TACTIC. IT'S...WE WANT TO PUNISH WHAT'S COMING DOWN THE LINE, SO WE'LL FILIBUSTER EVERYTHING ON THE WAY THERE. LR26CA IS A GOOD MEASURE THAT OFFERS ALL INDIVIDUALS A RIGHT IN THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS, SOMETHING THAT THIS COUNTRY HAS A HISTORY OF NOT DOING, AND I WANT TO ENSURE THAT THAT HAPPENS. SENATOR CHAMBERS WANTS TO SAY I'M THE EXAMPLE OF WHY YOUNG INDIVIDUALS SHOULDN'T BE IN THIS LEGISLATURE AND I GIVE THIS LEGISLATURE A BAD NAME BY SAYING THAT IF YOU'RE OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE, YOU SHOULD BE OLD ENOUGH TO SERVE IN THIS BODY. WELL, I STAND BY THAT. AND HE CAN CRITICIZE, NAME-CALL, AND PUT ME DOWN, AS HE WILL MOST OF YOU THROUGHOUT YOUR LEGISLATIVE CAREERS BECAUSE THAT'S HOW HE OPERATES, OR WE CAN RISE ABOVE, LIKE WE SHOULD, RISE ABOVE THE

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

PETTINESS THAT IS BEING DISPLAYED AND DEBATE THINGS IN THE LEGISLATURE ON WHAT THEY SHOULD BE DEBATED ON INSTEAD OF WHO INTRODUCED IT, AND I DON'T LIKE THEIR NEXT BILL SO I'M GOING TO FILIBUSTER THIS ONE, BECAUSE THAT'S WHAT THIS IS. REALLY, THIS ISN'T LR26CA; THIS IS LB970. SO WE CAN TALK ABOUT AGE AND MATURITY IN THE LEGISLATURE OR JUST DISCUSS THE STRAIGHT LEGISLATIVE TACTICS THAT ARE BEING USED ON THIS BILL OR RESOLUTION. LR26CA MAKES SENSE. IT SHOULD BE PUT IN FRONT OF THE VOTERS. AS I SAID, THIS COUNTRY, THIS STATE, FOR THAT MATTER, HAS A HISTORY OF DISENFRANCHISING INDIVIDUALS, WHETHER THAT BE BASED ON RACE OR GENDER. AND RIGHT NOW WE DISENFRANCHISE INDIVIDUALS BASED ON AGE AND THAT'S WRONG. WE'RE NOT HERE TO TELL PEOPLE THAT THEY SHOULDN'T PARTICIPATE OR BE INVOLVED IN GOVERNMENT. WE HAVE DONE THAT IN THE PAST. I WOULD LIKE TO CORRECT THAT ERROR. IT CONTINUALLY SHOWS THAT IF YOU DON'T EVEN BELIEVE THAT THE VOTERS SHOULD HAVE AN OPTION TO ELECT SOMEONE THAT CAN VOTE FOR THEM, THEY DON'T TRUST THE VOTERS. YOU DON'T TRUST YOUR OWN CONSTITUENTS. [LR26CA LB970]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: THEY'RE SMART ENOUGH TO VOTE FOR YOU, BUT NOT THE INDIVIDUAL THAT'S UNDER 21 THAT MIGHT BE BETTER, MIGHT HAVE A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE ISSUES. IT'S UNFORTUNATE, AS WE CONTINUE TO MOVE FORWARD, THAT WE WANT, SOME OF US WANT, TO ENFRANCHISE TO ENSURE THAT EVERYBODY HAS A VOICE. AND THIS FILIBUSTER ISN'T ABOUT LR26CA. IT IS A BILL...ABOUT LB970. THIS IS SENATOR CHAMBERS TRYING TO ENACT ESSENTIALLY PUNISHMENT ON ME AND THE REST OF THE BODY TO ENSURE THAT WE WASTE AS MUCH TIME AS POSSIBLE. I HAVE ALL THE FAITH IN THE SPEAKER THAT WE WILL GET THROUGH EVERYTHING THIS YEAR. I THINK HE'S DOING A GREAT JOB WITH THE SCHEDULE AND WILL CONTINUE ON THAT PATH. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA LB970]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR LARSON. SENATOR SCHNOOR, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHNOOR: THANK YOU, SIR. IF YOU LOOK AT THE AGENDA ON THE BOTTOM, IT SAYS LR35, A RESOLUTION TO PETITION CONGRESS TO CALL A CONVENTION OF THE STATES TO PROPOSE AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES. NOW, WHY AM I BRINGING THAT UP? BECAUSE YESTERDAY MORNING WE MET AT THE CORNHUSKER TO TALK ABOUT THAT

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

AND SENATOR TOM COBURN FROM OKLAHOMA WAS THERE AND HAD SOME GOOD CONVERSATIONS. BUT HE SAID, YOU KNOW WHAT THE MAIN PROBLEM IN WASHINGTON IS? HE SAYS, THERE IS NO LIFE EXPERIENCE. HE SAID THAT--AND I CAN'T REMEMBER THE EXACT NUMBER--BUT I THOUGHT HE SAID 75 PERCENT OF THE PEOPLE IN THE LEGISLATURE IN WASHINGTON HAVE NEVER HAD A JOB. THEY'VE NEVER WORKED FOR ANYBODY. THEY'VE BEEN A CAREER POLITICIAN. THEY HAVE NO LIFE EXPERIENCE. SO THAT'S COMING FROM WASHINGTON FROM A SENATOR THAT SERVED I THINK 12 YEARS, YOU KNOW, A WISE STATESMAN. BUT YET THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT THIS BILL WILL DO OR, EXCUSE ME, THIS LR WILL DO. IT WILL ALLOW, IF THIS WERE TO PASS AND GET VOTED ON AND PASS, THIS WOULD ALLOW 18-YEAR-OLDS, THAT HAVE ZERO LIFE EXPERIENCE, TO GIVE THEM THE OPPORTUNITY TO LEAD THE STATE OF NEBRASKA. SO I JUST LOOK AT THIS AS A VERY POOR DECISION ON OUR PART THAT WE SHOULD VOTE AGAINST. WE SHOULD NOT PASS THIS. I FEEL THIS IS BAD LEADERSHIP. AND I TALK ABOUT THE MILITARY. YOU DON'T GO IN THE MILITARY AND DEMAND THAT YOU'RE GOING TO BE A GENERAL, YOU WORK YOUR WAY UP THROUGH THE RANKS. IT TAKES TIME, IT TAKES TRAINING, IT TAKES MENTORING. ARE THERE UNIQUE INDIVIDUALS? YES, THERE ARE. THERE'S PROCESSES LAID OUT FOR THEM TO GET PROMOTED BELOW THE ZONE, TO GET PROMOTED AHEAD OF THEIR PEERS. BUT THEY DON'T START OUT AT 18 YEARS OLD SAYING, I'M GOING TO BE A GENERAL. IT DOESN'T WORK THAT WAY, BECAUSE THEY HAVE ZERO EXPERIENCE. SO I'M WITH SENATOR CHAMBERS ON THIS ONE, BELIEVE IT OR NOT, AND I AM GOING TO OPPOSE THIS AND I'LL HELP HIM OUT WHERE I NEED TO. AND I WILL GIVE THE REST OF MY TIME TO SENATOR CHAMBERS. [LR26CA LR35]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR SCHNOOR. SENATOR CHAMBERS, 1:30. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. THANK YOU, SENATOR SCHNOOR. THANK YOU, MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE. AND I'M GOING TO PERSIST IN FIGHTING THIS. IT IS BAD LEGISLATION. I DON'T CARE WHAT SENATOR LARSON SAYS, I DON'T CARE WHAT SENATOR MORFELD SAYS ON THIS PARTICULAR ISSUE. NOW THERE IS ANOTHER BLUNDER IN THEIR BILL AND I'D LIKE TO ASK SENATOR MORFELD A QUESTION. [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: SENATOR MORFELD, WOULD YOU YIELD, PLEASE? [LR26CA]

SENATOR MORFELD: YES. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SENATOR MORFELD, I MAY LABEL YOU...FIRST OF ALL, DO YOU SUPPORT THIS LR26CA? [LR26CA]

SENATOR MORFELD: YES, I DO. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: AND YOU SUPPORTED IT WHEN IT WAS INTRODUCED AND YOU SUPPORTED IT WHEN IT MOVED TO SELECT FILE, DIDN'T YOU? [LR26CA]

SENATOR MORFELD: I SUPPORTED IT WITH SOME AMENDMENTS, AS LONG AS THE AMENDMENTS WERE MADE ON SELECT FILE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: AND NOW I MIGHT DUB YOU THE BLUNDERER. YOU FOUND ANOTHER BLUNDER IN THERE, DIDN'T YOU, BECAUSE THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE CALLED YOU AND POINTED IT OUT. ISN'T THAT SO? [LR26CA]

SENATOR MORFELD: YES. IT'S A PART OF OUR PROCESS. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: WOULD YOU CALL IT A BLUNDER OR WOULD YOU SAY THAT THE LANGUAGE WOULD NOT NECESSARILY DO WHAT THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE FEARED IT WOULD DO? [LR26CA]

SENATOR MORFELD: I WOULDN'T CALL IT A BLUNDER. I THINK THAT THE LANGUAGE WOULD BE OKAY MOVING FORWARD, BUT I'M FINE WITH MAKING THE AMENDMENT. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SO THEN YOU'RE GOING TO KNUCKLE UNDER TO THE GOVERNOR AND CHANGE A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT JUST BECAUSE THE GOVERNOR SAID, CHANGE IT. AND YOU DON'T EVEN THINK THAT CHANGE IS NECESSARY, DO YOU? [LR26CA]

SENATOR MORFELD: I DON'T THINK IT WOULD BE FATAL TO THE BILL OR THE CONCEPT. THAT BEING SAID, I DON'T... [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: TIME, SENATORS. [LR26CA]

SENATOR MORFELD: THANK YOU. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR CHAMBERS AND SENATOR MORFELD.
[LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: SENATOR BLOOMFIELD, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I AM GOING TO SUPPORT THE BRACKET MOTION FOR THE REASONS THAT SENATOR CHAMBERS AND SENATOR SCHNOOR HAVE MENTIONED, AND THAT'S LIFE EXPERIENCE. I'M NOT GOING TO SAY THAT THE YOUNG PEOPLE WE SEE UP ABOVE US HAVE ZERO LIFE EXPERIENCE. THEY CERTAINLY DO HAVE LIFE EXPERIENCE. THEY'VE MADE IT TO BE 17, 18, SOME RARE CASES 19 YEARS OLD. THEY HAVE GAINED SOME LIFE EXPERIENCE. THE QUESTION THAT ARISES IS, HAVE THEY GAINED ENOUGH LIFE EXPERIENCE TO LEAD A STATE SUCH AS NEBRASKA? I THINK THE ANSWER THERE IS, PROBABLY NOT. I HAVE TOLD SENATOR LARSON BEFORE, I WOULD SUPPORT THIS BILL IF IT WERE BROUGHT DOWN TO BEING TO SERVE IN THE LEGISLATURE ONLY. THERE IS A CALMING INFLUENCE WITHIN THE LEGISLATURE BECAUSE YOU CAN TALK TO OTHER PEOPLE ABOUT WHAT'S GOING ON IN HERE. YOU HAVE 48 COLLEAGUES TO HELP GUIDE YOU AND GIVE YOU SOME INPUT. BUT AS FAR AS SERVING IN THE GOVERNOR'S POSITION, CERTAINLY YOU HAVE PEOPLE AROUND YOU. BUT WERE YOU TO SOMEHOW BECOME GOVERNOR AT 18, DO YOU EVEN KNOW ENOUGH PEOPLE TO APPOINT TO THOSE POSITIONS THAT ARE GOING TO ADVISE YOU? IT'S QUESTIONABLE. WE'RE ALSO TOLD, BY SENATOR MORFELD IN PARTICULAR, THAT PERHAPS WHEN WE REACH A CERTAIN AGE WE SHOULD BE ELIMINATED AND I DON'T NECESSARILY DISAGREE WITH THAT. BUT AT LEAST THE PEOPLE THAT HAVE ATTAINED SENATOR CHAMBERS' AGE OR MY AGE OR SOME OF THE OTHER WHITE-HAIRED FOLKS YOU SEE AROUND HERE HAVE HAD, AT ONE TIME, THE LIFE EXPERIENCE. DO WE REMEMBER EVERY DETAIL? DO WE REMEMBER EVERY FACE WE EVER SAW? NO, WE DON'T. BUT AT LEAST WE WERE THERE WHEN THE EXPERIENCE CAME BY. AGAIN, I WOULD SUPPORT THIS THING IF IT WERE JUST IN THE LEGISLATIVE BODY. I CANNOT SUPPORT IT FOR A HIGHER OFFICE THAN THAT. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR BLOOMFIELD. (VISITORS INTRODUCED.) SENATOR HILKEMANN, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SENATOR HILKEMANN: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER. I RISE TO SUPPORT THE BRACKET BILL (SIC) FOR LR26CA HERE. I THINK, SENATOR BLOOMFIELD, YOU HIT IT RIGHT ON THE HEAD. IF THIS WAS FOR LEGISLATIVE POSITIONS, I WOULD PROBABLY NOT HAVE THE DIFFICULTY THAT I'M HAVING WITH THIS BILL. I THINK THAT WHAT WE'VE HEARD OVER THE COURSE OF THIS DAY IS, THE EXPERIENCE AND LIFE EXPERIENCES ARE A KEY FACTOR OF IT. I ALSO, WHILE I'VE GOT THE MIKE HERE, I'D JUST LIKE TO TAKE A MOMENT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE TO...WE JUST INTRODUCED JAYANN SEPICH. THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER. JAYANN IS HERE. SHE IS THE FOUNDER OF DNA SAVES, WHICH IS... YOU MAY HAVE HEARD OF KATY'S LAW. HER DAUGHTER WAS BRUTALLY MURDERED AND WAS...THE MURDERER WAS IDENTIFIED THROUGH DNA EVIDENCE. SHE'S GOING TO BE MAKING A PRESENTATION TOMORROW MORNING AT 11:30...OR IN ROOM 1113 AT 8:00. THOSE OF YOU THAT ARE NOT FAMILIAR WITH THAT PARTICULAR BILL, SHE'LL BE SHARING HER TESTIMONY AND SHARING HER LIFE EXPERIENCES IN MOVING THIS BILL FORWARD. AND WITH THAT, THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER. [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR HILKEMANN. ITEMS FOR THE RECORD, MR. CLERK?

CLERK: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. PRIORITY BILL DESIGNATIONS: HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, LB698 AND LB1032; SENATOR WILLIAMS, LB919; SENATOR FOX, LB1009. I HAVE A HEARING NOTICE FROM THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE. SENATOR KOLOWSKI OFFERS LR438; THAT WILL BE LAID OVER. YOUR COMMITTEE ON RETIREMENT SYSTEMS, CHAIRED BY SENATOR KOLTERMAN, REPORTS LB1069 AS INDEFINITELY POSTPONED. BUSINESS AND LABOR, CHAIRED BY SENATOR BURKE HARR, REPORTS LB983 TO GENERAL FILE; LB830 AND LB855 TO GENERAL FILE WITH AMENDMENTS. AND, FINALLY, ENROLLMENT AND REVIEW REPORTS LB676, LB798, LB778, AND LB864 TO SELECT FILE. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGES 587-589.) [LB698 LB1032 LB919 LB1009 LR438 LB1069 LB983 LB830 LB855 LB676 LB798 LB778 LB864]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, MR. CLERK. SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED, TO BE FOLLOWED BY SENATOR SCHUMACHER, LARSON, BRASCH, MORFELD, MURANTE, AND WILLIAMS IN THE QUEUE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, I'D LIKE TO ASK SENATOR LARSON A QUESTION. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

PRESIDENT FOLEY: SENATOR LARSON, WOULD YOU YIELD, PLEASE? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: YES. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SENATOR LARSON, WHEN YOU WERE BACK THERE WHINING ABOUT WHAT I'M DOING, DID YOU SAY THAT I USE NAME-CALLING WITH REFERENCE TO YOU? AND IF SO, I'D LIKE...FIRST OF ALL, DID YOU SAY THAT? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: YES. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: OKAY. GIVE ME AN EXAMPLE OF WHEN I USE NAME-CALLING. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: YOU'VE CALLED ME SENATOR "ARSON" BEFORE. YOU'VE CALLED ME... [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: CALLED YOU SENATOR WHO? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: YOU'VE CALLED ME SENATOR "ARSON" BEFORE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THAT'S NAME-CALLING? OKAY. OKAY, GO AHEAD. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: I WOULD SAY THAT YOU APPROPRIATELY NOT USING MY RIGHT NAME. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: OKAY. SEE, THAT I THINK IS JUVENILE. GIVE ME ANOTHER EXAMPLE, ONE MORE MATURE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: WOULD YOU SAY YOU WERE BEING MATURE BY CALLING ME SENATOR "ARSON"? [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: NO. YOU'RE TAKING THAT TO BE NAME-CALLING. AND IF YOU DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT I'M SAYING, THAT ONCE AGAIN SHOWS IMMATURITY. NOW, COME ON, LET'S BE GROWN MEN. GIVE ME AN EXAMPLE OF NAME-CALLING. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SENATOR LARSON: I THINK, SENATOR CHAMBERS, ANY TIME YOU TRY TO USE WORDS TO DEGRADE OR PUT DOWN SOMEONE, IT SHOWS THAT... [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: NO. SHOW ME...TELL ME THE NAME-CALLING. YOU USED THAT WORD. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: WHEN YOU SAID...SENATOR CHAMBERS, AGAIN, AS I SAID, WHEN YOU USE YOUR WORDS TO TRY TO DEGRADE OR PUT DOWN SOMEONE, THAT IN AND OF ITSELF IS NAME-CALLING OR IT... [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: OKAY, THANK YOU. THANK YOU. MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, THIS MAN IS CONFUSED. HE KNOWS HOW WE DEBATE ON THIS FLOOR. HIS NAME IS LARSON. WE'RE IN DEBATE AND I SAY "ARSON." THAT'S NAME-CALLING TO HIM. THERE ARE TERMS THAT HAVE BEEN APPLIED TO ME, WHICH WERE NOT NAME-CALLING, BUT THEY WERE NOT MY NAME. AND TO SAY THAT WORDS ARE USED TO DEGRADE, IF I SAY THAT SOMEBODY IS IGNORANT OF A BILL OR IGNORANT OF THE LAW, I POINT IT OUT AND I ASK QUESTIONS AND THE PERSON'S INABILITY TO ANSWER INDICATES THAT MY DESCRIPTION WAS CORRECT. NOW, I MAKE HATS. IF YOU PULL ONE OUT AND STICK IT ON YOUR HEAD, THAT'S ON YOU, NOT ME. YOU DECIDED IT'D FIT AND THAT'S WHAT YOU DID. BUT IF YOU'VE GOT TO WHINE IN THE WAY YOU'RE DOING, WHINE ON, BUT IT DEMONSTRATES THE TRUTH OF WHAT I'VE SAID. THERE ARE SOME PEOPLE WHO LACK THE MATURITY TO BE IN A BODY SUCH AS THIS. AND I'M NOT GOING TO DEAL WITH YOU ALL AS IF YOU'RE KINDERGARTENERS. AND IF I'M GOING TO DO THAT, I TELL YOU THAT, THAT BECAUSE OF THE WAY THE THINGS ARE GOING, THIS IS WORTHY OF SOMETHING ON A SCHOOL PLAYGROUND. OBVIOUSLY, MR. LARSON HAS NOT READ HISTORY. HE CERTAINLY HASN'T READ ANY OF THE DEBATES THAT OCCUR IN PARLIAMENT. HE HASN'T READ ANY OF THE DEBATES THAT OCCUR IN CONGRESS. AND CERTAINLY HE DID NOT READ ANY OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL DEBATES THAT WERE RAGING WHEN THEY WERE TALKING ABOUT WHAT OUGHT TO BE IN THE CONSTITUTION THAT GOVERNS THIS COUNTRY. IF HE IS SO TENDER AND SENSITIVE, THAT'S HIM. BUT I AM NOT GOING TO GEAR WHAT I SAY TO A THIRD GRADER. WHEN I'M DEALING WITH THIRD GRADERS, I DEAL WITH THIRD GRADERS AS THIRD GRADERS. WE ARE TALKING ABOUT THIS BODY. AND I BELIEVE IN OBJECT LESSONS. THE BEST WAY TO MAKE A DEMONSTRATION IS TO HAVE IT OCCUR ON THIS FLOOR AND YOU SAW A DEMONSTRATION OF THAT. IF I SAID SOMEBODY ENGAGED IN NAME-CALLING, I WOULD HAVE THE NAME-CALLING JUST LIKE THAT. ONE DAY WE WERE DEBATING AND I REFERRED TO SENATOR WATERMEIER I THINK MAYBE AS SENATOR "WATERMAN" OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT. AND HE DIDN'T TAKE THAT

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

AS NAME-CALLING. I SIMPLY MISSPOKE. IF I CALLED SENATOR LARSON SENATOR "ARSON," I PROBABLY DID THAT ON PURPOSE, BUT HE DIDN'T OBJECT AT THE TIME. HE'S GOING TO LET THIS STUFF EAT HIM ALIVE ALL THIS TIME. [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THIS IS WHAT I'M TALKING ABOUT WHEN I SAY THERE'S A CERTAIN LEVEL OF MATURITY THAT'S NEEDED. YOU DRAW AN ARBITRARY LINE WHEN YOU'RE SETTING THE AGE LIMIT FOR ANYTHING. A PERSON BELOW THE AGE OF 21 IS LIMITED IN TERMS OF CONTRACTS. THAT DOESN'T SAY THAT EVERYBODY BELOW 21 DOESN'T KNOW ENOUGH TO SIGN A CONTRACT OR SOMEBODY ABOVE AUTOMATICALLY DOES. YOU NEED SOMETHING FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE LAW AS A GUIDE, AS A POINT FROM WHICH THINGS ARE DONE, A POINT FROM WHICH JUDGMENTS ARE MADE. AND IF HE DOESN'T UNDERSTAND THAT, HE'S CERTAINLY NOT GOING TO UNDERSTAND OTHER THINGS. AND IF I GIVE A DESCRIPTION AND HE APPLIES IT TO HIMSELF, THAT'S ON HIM, NOT ME. IF I DESCRIBE A DONKEY AND I SAY, FOUR-LEGGED, STUBBORN, LONG EARS, AND SAYS HEEHAW, AND THEN HE JUMPS UP AND SAYS, ERNIE, YOU CALLED ME...I SAY, NO, NO,... [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: TIME, SENATOR. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...I DESCRIBED IT AND YOU APPLIED IT TO YOURSELF. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

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

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: THANK YOU, MR. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR, MEMBERS OF THE BODY. WOULD SENATOR MORFELD ANSWER A COUPLE QUESTIONS? [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: SENATOR MORFELD, WOULD YOU YIELD, PLEASE? [LR26CA]

SENATOR MORFELD: YES. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: THANK YOU, SENATOR MORFELD. COUPLE OF QUESTIONS: FIRST OF ALL, I THINK YOU MENTIONED THE CASE THAT YOU READ

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

WHEN YOU WERE ANALYZING REDRAFTING THIS PARTICULAR PROPOSITION. WHAT WAS THAT CASE THAT YOU READ? [LR26CA]

SENATOR MORFELD: LOONTJER, THE ONE THAT YOU REFERENCED ON THE FLOOR. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: WHICH LOONTJER CASE? [LR26CA]

SENATOR MORFELD: STATE OF NEBRASKA, PATRICIA LOONTJER v. JOHN A. GALE, FILED ON SEPTEMBER 5, 2014. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: THANK YOU. AND TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, SENATOR MORFELD, ARE THE GOVERNOR AND THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT? [LR26CA]

SENATOR MORFELD: YES. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: THANK YOU. MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, I RAISED THE ISSUES OF MULTIPLE SUBJECTS IN THIS BILL WHEN I FIRST SAW IT. I HAVE A GREAT DEAL OF EXPERIENCE WITH MULTIPLE SUBJECTS IN PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, BEEN INVOLVED WITH THE THING FOR MANY YEARS. THERE'S ANOTHER LOONTJER CASE; SHE HAPPENS TO LIKE SUING PEOPLE. THIS ONE WAS LOONTJER v. ROBINSON. IN LOONTJER v. ROBINSON, THE BRIEFS IN THAT CASE GO ON AND ON EXAMINING THE ISSUE OF MULTIPLE SUBJECTS. WHEN YOU READ LOONTJER v. ROBINSON IN THE CONTEXT OF LOONTJER v. GALE AND SEE THE SUPREME COURT APPLYING THOSE ENORMOUSLY STRICT RULES TO THINGS INTRODUCED BY THE LEGISLATURE, YOU REALIZE THAT YOU BETTER GO OVER THESE THINGS OVER AND OVER AND OVER AGAIN, BECAUSE THE SLIGHTEST HINT OF A SECOND SUBJECT AND YOU'RE OUT ON YOUR BEHIND. WELL, THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT PROPOSES, AT LEAST I SEE, THREE OR FOUR MULTIPLE SUBJECTS LEFT. FIRST OF ALL, THERE'S A PARAGRAPH DEALING WITH THE LEGISLATURE, ONE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT. A SECOND PARAGRAPH SAYS THAT ALL MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT ARE SUBJECT TO THESE AGE CRITERIA. THEN YOU HAVE ANOTHER PARAGRAPH THAT SAYS THE GOVERNOR IS SUBJECTED TO THE AGE CRITERIA AND ANOTHER PARAGRAPH THAT SAYS THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR IS SUBJECT TO THE AGE CRITERIA. NOW, THE COURTS HAVE BEEN PRETTY CLEAR ON THIS STUFF IN SAYING THAT WHEN YOU WRITE SOMETHING INTO THE CONSTITUTION, YOU'RE PRESUMED TO KNOW WHAT

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

YOU'RE DOING AND YOU'RE PRESUMED TO WRITE IT SO THAT EVERY WORD HAS MEANING. AND IF YOU REPEAT SOMETHING IN ONE PLACE AND REPEAT IT IN ANOTHER, IT MUST HAVE DIFFERENT MEANING OR YOU WOULDN'T HAVE SAID IT IN THE FIRST PLACE. SO LOOKING AT THIS, NOT ONLY DO YOU HAVE EXECUTIVE PEOPLE AND LEGISLATIVE PEOPLE, CLEARLY TWO SUBJECTS IMPACTED BY THE NEW LANGUAGE, BUT NOW WE HAVE TO PUT OURSELVES IN THE SHOES OF THE COURT AND SAY, NOW WHY WOULD A SMART LEGISLATURE, WITH ALL DUE CONSIDERATION AND MATURITY, PROPOSE...SAY IN ONE PARAGRAPH, ALL MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE ARE AFFECTED, ANOTHER PARAGRAPH SAYING, THE GOVERNOR IS AFFECTED, ANOTHER PARAGRAPH SAYING THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR IS AFFECTED? SINCE WE KNOW THEY MUST HAVE MEANT A DIFFERENCE, WE'RE GOING TO GO FISHING AND TRYING TO DIVINE THAT DIFFERENCE. WHY DID THEY DO IT? THEY MUST HAVE FELT THAT THERE WERE THREE QUESTIONS THERE: THE GOVERNOR; THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR; AND EVERYBODY ELSE. OTHERWISE, WHY WOULD THEY HAVE MADE IT THREE ISSUES? WHY WOULDN'T HAVE THEY JUST SAID, AND THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH? THAT WAY THERE WOULD ONLY BE TWO ISSUES IN THIS CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH AND THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH,... [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: ...RATHER THAN POTENTIALLY FOUR REMAINING ISSUES. IF WE'RE GOING TO PUT SOMETHING BEFORE THE PEOPLE, WE BETTER KNOW HOW TO DO IT IN THE RIGHT WAY, RATHER THAN HAVE THE THING YANKED FROM THE BALLOT AFTER SOME EXPENSE HAS BEEN PAID OR SPENT BY BOTH SIDES AND LAWYERS HAVING TO ARGUE BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT AND THE SUPREME COURT KILLING TIME ON SOMETHING WHERE WE SHOULD HAVE KNOWN BETTER TO BEGIN WITH. I'M NOT EVEN GOING TO GET INTO THE MERITS OF YES OR NO ON 18-YEAR-OLDS SERVING IN OFFICE. WE AREN'T THAT FAR YET. WE HAVEN'T EVEN GOTTEN A DECENT PROPOSAL. CLEARLY, ADMITTEDLY, THE ONE THAT FIRST CAME TO US, THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN REVIEWED BY THE INTRODUCER AND BY THE LAWYERS WHO SIGNED ONTO IT, WAS DEFECTIVE, HIGHLY DEFECTIVE. AND SO WE GOT AN EDITED VERSION. THEN THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE APPARENTLY SAID, WHOA, YOU'RE ADDING ANOTHER SUBJECT BY MAKING IT SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS... [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: TIME, SENATOR. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: ...ESTABLISHED BY LAW. AND NOW THAT'S GONE.
[LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: TIME, SENATOR. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: THANK YOU. [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR SCHUMACHER. SENATOR LARSON,
YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. REAL QUICK, WHO ARE WE TO
JUDGE WHAT ARE AND ARE NOT ENOUGH OF LIFE EXPERIENCES? WHO ARE WE
TO JUDGE WHAT SOMEBODY HAS BEEN THROUGH WHEN WE DON'T KNOW WHAT
THEY'VE BEEN THROUGH? WE DON'T KNOW WHAT ANY OF THESE HIGH SCHOOL
KIDS IN THE BALCONY HAVE BEEN THROUGH. AND WE DON'T KNOW IF THEY
HAVE THE LIFE EXPERIENCES, IF THEY'VE STARTED A BUSINESS. MARK
ZUCKERBERG WAS A BILLIONAIRE BY 20. IS THAT ENOUGH BUSINESS
EXPERIENCE FOR YOU? WE SHOULDN'T BE THE JUDGE; LET THE VOTERS DECIDE.
I'LL YIELD SENATOR MORFELD THE REST OF MY TIME TO TALK ABOUT SENATOR
SCHUMACHER'S CONCERNS. [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR LARSON. SENATOR MORFELD, 4:00.
[LR26CA]

SENATOR MORFELD: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. JUST IN RESPONSE TO
SENATOR SCHUMACHER'S ARGUMENTS, I WANT TO MAKE IT VERY CLEAR THE
COURT, IN LOONTJER, STATED THAT YOU CAN HAVE MULTIPLE ISSUES THAT ARE
ADDRESSED BY ONE SINGLE QUESTION, AS LONG AS THERE IS A UNIFYING
PRIMARY PURPOSE THAT GOES TO THE CORE OF WHAT THE PURPOSE OF THE
AMENDMENT IS SUPPOSED TO BE. NOW IN HERE, IT'S VERY CLEAR IN THE
COMMITTEE STATEMENT--AND THAT'S WHAT THE COURT LOOKED AT IN
LOONTJER--IT'S VERY CLEAR THAT THE PURPOSE OF THIS CONSTITUTIONAL
AMENDMENT IS TO MAKE IT SO THAT THE STATE ELECTED OFFICES, THE
LEGISLATURE, THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR, AND THE GOVERNOR, BE
AVAILABLE AND OPEN TO THOSE THAT ARE 18 YEARS OF AGE, THE FEDERAL
VOTING AGE. IT'S VERY CLEAR WHAT THE PRIMARY PURPOSE OF THIS
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT IS. SO, THEREFORE, MULTIPLE AREAS OF THE
CONSTITUTION CAN BE AFFECTED AS LONG AS THERE'S A UNIFYING PURPOSE--
AND I'M USING THE LANGUAGE OF THE COURT CASE--A UNIFYING PURPOSE

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

BASED ON THE PRIMARY PURPOSE OF WHAT THE INTENT OF THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT IS SUPPOSED TO BE. NOW THE COURT CITES SEVERAL DIFFERENT CASES FROM OTHER COURTS AND OTHER SUPREME COURTS ACROSS THE COUNTRY WHERE THOSE CASES AND THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES ALSO TOUCHED SEVERAL DIFFERENT AREAS OF THEIR STATE CONSTITUTIONS. ONE EXAMPLE WAS IN WISCONSIN. THEY HAD MADE IT SO THAT THE LEGISLATURE WOULD ONLY MEET EVERY TWO YEARS OR THAT'S WHAT THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT WAS. AND SO THEY ALSO CHANGED IT SO THAT THE ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES WOULD BE ELECTED EVERY TWO YEARS AS WELL INSTEAD OF ONE YEAR, BECAUSE IF YOU HAVE A SESSION EVERY TWO YEARS, LEGISLATORS THAT ARE ELECTED EVERY YEAR WOULD HAVE A YEAR WHERE THEY HAVE ABSOLUTELY NO PURPOSE. AND THE COURT IN WISCONSIN SAID, YES, YOU CAN ALSO CHANGE IT SO THAT ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES ARE ELECTED EVERY TWO YEARS, BECAUSE THAT'S A PART OF THE PRIMARY PURPOSE OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. AND THE NEBRASKA SUPREME COURT CITED THAT SAME CASE IN LOONTJER IN SUPPORT OF THE FACT THAT YOU CAN HAVE DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE CONSTITUTION IMPACTED AND PUT UNDER ONE SINGLE QUESTION, AS LONG AS IT IS RELATED TO THE PRIMARY PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. NOW SENATOR SCHUMACHER CAN POKE HOLES ALL HE WANTS, BUT WHEN HE TELLS ME THERE'S A CASE OUT THERE, I NEED TO LOOK AT IT. AND WE NEED TO MAKE SURE THAT THIS PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT IS CONSTITUTIONAL BASED ON THAT CASE. I WENT OUT, DID MY DUE DILIGENCE, LOOKED AT IT, MADE THE APPROPRIATE AMENDMENTS, AND THAT'S WHAT WE END UP WITH HERE TODAY WITH AM2043. [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR MORFELD: NOW, THE NOTION THAT THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE'S RECOMMENDED AMENDMENT TO TAKE OUT, "SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS, OTHER THAN AGE, ESTABLISHED BY LAW," WOULD MAKE A SECOND QUESTION IS FALSE. THAT WAS SIMPLY A PREFERENCE BY THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE TO MAKE IT ALIGN...THE CURRENT OFFICE QUALIFICATIONS ALIGN WITH THE CURRENT OFFICE QUALIFICATIONS. IT DOESN'T CREATE A SECOND SUBJECT OR ANYTHING LIKE THAT. IT'S RELATED TO THE FIRST SUBJECT. NOW WE CAN DISAGREE WHETHER OR NOT PUTTING THIS AMENDMENT ON THE BALLOT IS A GOOD IDEA. THAT'S FINE. I THINK THAT THAT'S A LEGITIMATE DISAGREEMENT TO HAVE. BUT THIS AMENDMENT FOLLOWS THE COURT PRECEDENT. NOW WE CAN SIT AROUND AND SPECULATE ON HOW THE COURT MIGHT CHANGE THEIR PRECEDENT AND MAY CHANGE DIRECTIONS, BUT IN THAT CASE, WE SHOULDN'T

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

LEGISLATE OR PROPOSE ANY CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS BECAUSE THERE'S A POSSIBILITY THE COURT MIGHT FIND SOMETHING DIFFERENT THAN WHAT THEY'VE CURRENTLY FOUND. [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: TIME, SENATOR. [LR26CA]

SENATOR MORFELD: THANK YOU. [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR MORFELD. SENATOR BRASCH, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR BRASCH: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, AND GOOD MORNING, COLLEAGUES. I CONTINUE TO HAVE CONCERNS AND WILL NOT SUPPORT LR26CA AND IT'S NOT DISRESPECTFUL TO ANYONE AT THE AGE OF 18, NOT WHATSOEVER. AND IT'S NOT SECOND-GUESSING THEIR ABILITIES OR THEIR POTENTIALS. SOMETHING THAT I AM CHALLENGED WITH, AND I BELIEVE WE ALL ARE HERE AS WE SEE HUNDREDS AND THOUSANDS OF ISSUES AND BILLS THAT COME BEFORE US EVERY DAY, IS DISCERNMENT. HOW DOES THAT HAPPEN? LAST YEAR I DID SUPPORT AND COMMENDED SENATOR MORFELD ON HIS BILL THAT WOULD TAKE A CAREFUL LOOK AT THOSE MINORS IN POSSESSION BECAUSE OF THEIR DISCERNMENT AND INABILITY TO JUDGE THE CONSEQUENCES OF OVERINDULGING OR DRINKING, BREAKING A LAW, TO BE A MINOR IN POSSESSION, PERHAPS A MINOR DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE. THIS YEAR, I BELIEVE WE'RE HEARING SOME BILLS ABOUT TRYING TO HELP THOSE WHO ARE BURDENED WITH STUDENT LOANS BECAUSE OF THEIR YOUNG AGE, THAT WE SHOULD TRY TO HELP THEM BECAUSE IT'S HARD TO GET STARTED IN LIFE AND IT'S HARD TO GET STARTED WITH STUDENT DEBT. WHEN IT COMES TO AN 18-YEAR-OLD, VISITED WITH SEVERAL SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS AND ASKED THEM THEIR THOUGHTS. EVERYONE AGREES THEY HAVE ASTOUNDING ACCOMPLISHMENTS, BUT THEY HAVE MANY CHALLENGES ALSO: GETTING HOMEWORK DONE, FOR ONE; ATTENDANCE; OTHER ITEMS. THEY LIVE AT HOME FOR THE MOST PART AT AGE 18. THEY HAVE A LOT OF LIFE BEYOND THEIR CONGRATULATORY LETTERS THAT WE WRITE. SINCE I'VE BEEN IN THIS OFFICE FOR SIX YEARS, AND I'M CONFIDENT OTHERS, WE'VE SEEN LIFE CHANGES AND LIFE CHALLENGES FOR SOME OF OUR COLLEAGUES. BECOMING A SINGLE PARENT HAS BEEN BROUGHT UP ON THE FLOOR AND, YES, THAT'S VERY DIFFICULT. PARENTING IS VERY DIFFICULT. WE'VE SEEN SOME MARRIAGES CHALLENGED. LIFE IN PUBLIC OFFICE CAN BECOME OVERWHELMING, LIFE ENCOMPASSING. THERE'S A LOT OF REALLY TOUGH THINGS. IT'S NOT SEEING US

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

IN A PARADE WAVING AT PEOPLE AND THROWING CANDY TO THE SIDE. WE HAVE A LOT OF TOUGH DECISION, A LOT OF SLEEPLESS NIGHTS. BUT MOST OF US IN HERE--AND I THINK ALL OF US, YOU KNOW--WE'VE GONE THROUGH SOME MONUMENTAL CHANGES OF BUILDING OUR LIVES, THAT WE'RE STILL IN THE BUILDING MODE, THAT WE STILL...AND WE SEE THE SCOPE OF ISSUES THAT ARE BEFORE US, THE CHALLENGES, THE RESPONSIBILITY. WE'RE NOT JUDGING ANYONE BECAUSE OF THEIR AGE. WE'RE JUST HOPING FOR THE BEST DISCERNMENT AND EXPERIENCES POSSIBLE. I'VE BEEN TO A LOT OF GRADUATIONS ACROSS MY DISTRICT. I'VE BEEN TO EAGLE SCOUT CEREMONIES. AND I APPLAUD AND I EMBRACE WHAT THEY SEE AHEAD OF THEM, BUT THERE'S SO MUCH MORE. AND I KNOW SENATOR CHAMBERS LIKES LYRICS TO MUSIC AND ONE OF MY FAVORITE OF BENEVOLENCE IS "MY WISH." [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR BRASCH: I DO WISH THAT THESE 18-YEAR-OLDS, THAT THEY FIND THE ROAD, MANY ROADS IN THEIR FUTURES. AND I HOPE THAT THEIR WORRIES STAY SMALL AND THEIR DREAMS STAY BIG AND THAT THEY DON'T HAVE TO CARRY MORE THAN THEY CAN HOLD. THIS IS SOMETHING THAT IS NOT TAKEN LIGHTLY, NOT BECAUSE WE FEEL LESS OF AN 18-YEAR-OLD, BECAUSE WE WANT MORE FOR THEM. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, AND THANK YOU, COLLEAGUES. [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR BRASCH. SENATOR MORFELD, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR MORFELD: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. NOW THAT WE'VE DISCUSSED THE CASE LAW AND THE CONSTITUTION A LITTLE BIT, I JUST WANT TO GET BACK TO THE MERITS OF THIS. FIRST, I'D LIKE TO REMIND EVERYBODY THAT THIS IS ALLOWING THE VOTERS TO DECIDE, NUMBER ONE, WHETHER OR NOT 18-YEAR-OLDS WOULD EVEN BE ABLE TO BE QUALIFIED FOR THESE OFFICES AT ALL. SO THERE'S THAT CONSIDERATION RIGHT AWAY. SECOND, THERE'S NO GUARANTEE IF WE ENACT THIS OR IF THE VOTERS ENACT IT THAT ANY 18-YEAR-OLD WOULD BE IN OFFICE UNLESS IT WAS DECIDED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEBRASKA OR THEIR LEGISLATIVE DISTRICT. IT'S NO GUARANTEE THAT AN 18-YEAR-OLD IS GOING TO BE IN THE LEGISLATURE, BUT THEY COULD RUN, THEY COULD MAKE THEIR CASE. AND I BELIEVE THAT WE SHOULD ALLOW SOMEBODY THAT IS OF VOTING AGE, SOMEBODY THAT IS LEGALLY AN ADULT TO BE ABLE TO MAKE THAT DECISION WHETHER OR NOT THEY WANT TO RUN FOR

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

OFFICE. AND THEN WE SHOULD ALLOW THE VOTERS OF THEIR DISTRICT TO DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT THEY'RE MATURE ENOUGH, WHETHER OR NOT THEY HAVE ENOUGH DISCERNMENT, WHETHER OR NOT THEY HAVE ENOUGH RESPONSIBILITY TO BE ABLE TO HOLD THAT OFFICE. I THINK THAT AGE IS A POOR PROXY FOR WISDOM IN MANY CASES. SOMETIMES AGE CAN BRING WISDOM. SOMETIMES IT CANNOT. I'VE SEEN FOOLISH OLD PEOPLE AND I'VE SEEN FOOLISH YOUNG PEOPLE. I'VE SEEN WISE YOUNG PEOPLE AND WISE OLD PEOPLE. WE SHOULD ALLOW THE VOTERS TO DECIDE WHO THEY WANT TO BE THEIR REPRESENTATIVE, IF PEOPLE ARE OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE. IN TERMS OF MY BILL LAST YEAR THAT WOULD ADDRESS SOME ALCOHOL ISSUES, PARTICULARLY YOUNG PEOPLE, BEING AS THOUGH WE DO NOT ALLOW FOLKS FROM THE AGE OF 18 TO 21, AND BELOW 18 AS WELL, TO BE ABLE TO DRINK. MANY OF THEM ARE CONCERNED ABOUT THE LEGAL CONSEQUENCES OF BEING ABLE TO PROVIDE IMPORTANT MEDICAL ASSISTANCE TO SOME OF THEIR FRIENDS AND FAMILY WHEN THEY'VE BEEN DRINKING TOO MUCH AND THEY'RE UNDERAGE. THAT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH WHETHER OR NOT THEY'RE MATURE ENOUGH TO HOLD OFFICE. IT'S JUST SIMPLY A FACT THAT 18- TO 21-YEAR-OLDS ARE NOT ALLOWED TO DRINK. WE'VE MADE THAT DECISION. AND THERE'S SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS, LEGAL CONSEQUENCES AND CONSIDERATIONS THAT HAVE TO BE MADE. THERE ARE OLDER PEOPLE THAT DO NOT HAVE GREAT DISCERNMENT WITH ALCOHOL, THAT CAN JUST AS EASILY GET IMPAIRED AS A YOUNG PERSON AND OFTEN DO. THE BOTTOM LINE IS, IS THIS CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, THIS PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT DOES NOT GUARANTEE THAT ANYBODY NECESSARILY IS GOING TO BE ELECTED AT THE AGE OF 18 OR 19 OR WHATEVER THE CASE MAY BE. IT SIMPLY PUTS IT IN THE HANDS OF THE VOTERS TO DECIDE WHETHER THAT'S WISE. AND THEN IT PUTS IT IN THE HANDS OF THE VOTERS TO DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT THEY ELECT THAT INDIVIDUAL TO BE THEIR REPRESENTATIVE. WE SHOULD ALLOW THE VOTERS TO DECIDE THAT. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR MORFELD. SENATOR MURANTE, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR MURANTE: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. MEMBERS, GOOD MORNING. I RISE IN OPPOSITION TO THE BRACKET MOTION AND IN CONTINUED SUPPORT OF LR26CA. AND I'D LIKE TO ARTICULATE A LITTLE BIT ABOUT WHY THE STATE OF NEBRASKA IS IN A UNIQUE POSITION ACROSS THE COUNTRY TO PASS A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT LIKE LR26CA, BECAUSE THERE'S A PRACTICAL REALITY ABOUT HOW THIS STATE WORKS. IN THIS STATE, THE PEOPLE ARE THE

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SECOND HOUSE. THE PEOPLE OF NEBRASKA HAVE THE ABILITY TO PETITION THE GOVERNMENT IF THEY GET SUFFICIENT SIGNATURES TO HAVE EITHER STATUTES OR CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS CHANGED ON THE BALLOT. AND AS WE SIT HERE TODAY, THERE WILL BE AN ISSUE, THERE WILL BE NUMEROUS ISSUES DECIDED IN THIS GENERAL ELECTION BALLOT. THERE WILL BE LIFE-OR-DEATH ISSUES DECIDED ON THIS GENERAL ELECTION BALLOT. WE'LL TALK ABOUT THE REFERENDUM ON OUR VOTE LAST YEAR TO REPEAL THE DEATH PENALTY. WE'VE HAD VOTES IN THE PAST ABOUT WHAT THE DEFINITION OF MARRIAGE IS. AND WE MAY HAVE...THERE'S A PROPOSAL IN THIS LEGISLATURE TO HAVE THAT DISCUSSION AGAIN AS A VOTE OF THE PEOPLE. AND AS A PRACTICAL REALITY, 18-YEAR-OLDS HAVE A SAY IN THAT PROCESS. THEY GET TO VOTE. THEY GET TO DECIDE WHAT THE STATUTES AND THE CONSTITUTION OF NEBRASKA LOOK LIKE. THIS LEGISLATURE DOESN'T HAVE THAT AUTHORITY. THIS LEGISLATURE CAN'T AMEND THE CONSTITUTION. WE, AS A MATTER OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, SAY THAT 18-YEAR-OLDS HAVE A RIGHT TO GO TO THE POLLS AND DETERMINE FOR THEMSELVES HOW THE STATUTES OF NEBRASKA READ. AND 18-YEAR-OLDS HAVE THE POWER TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION. THEY ALREADY HAVE THAT POWER IN THIS STATE. SO WHAT WE'RE SAYING IS, AS A MATTER OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, 18-YEAR-OLDS HAVE THE ABILITY TO GO TO THE POLLS AND AMEND THEIR OWN CONSTITUTION. THEY HAVE THE ABILITY TO GO TO THE POLLS AND REPEAL AN ACT OF THE LEGISLATURE. THEY HAVE THE ABILITY TO GO TO THE POLLS AND AMEND STATE STATUTE. BUT, BY GOD, IF THEY COME TO THIS LEGISLATURE, THEIR BRAINS AREN'T DEVELOPED ENOUGH TO REQUIRE NOTICE AND A COMMENT PERIOD REGARDING ZONING ORDINANCES AFFECTING CERTAIN EXTRATERRITORIAL ZONING JURISDICTIONS--NOT QUALIFIED FOR THAT. COME ON, LR26CA DOESN'T GIVE THE PEOPLE OF NEBRASKA...THE 18-YEAR-OLDS OF NEBRASKA SUBSTANTIALLY MORE AUTHORITY THAN THEY ALREADY HAVE. THEY CAN ALREADY CHANGE THE CONSTITUTION. THEY CAN ALREADY CHANGE STATE STATUTES. NOW IF SOMEONE WOULD LIKE TO INTRODUCE A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO SAY, 18- TO 21-YEAR-OLDS, YOUR BRAINS ARE NOT DEVELOPED ENOUGH TO VOTE ON REFERENDUM AND ISSUES PLACED ON THE PETITION, YOU CAN'T VOTE ON THOSE, I'D BE INTERESTED TO HAVE THAT DISCUSSION. BUT THE PEOPLE ARE...THE PEOPLE OF NEBRASKA HAVE ALREADY GIVEN THIS AUTHORITY TO 18-YEAR-OLDS. WE'VE ALREADY DETERMINED THAT 18-YEAR-OLDS ARE QUALIFIED TO VOTE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS AND STATUTES. LR26CA IS CONSISTENT WITH THAT POLICY. IT DOESN'T CONTRADICT IT. I'D ENCOURAGE YOU TO OPPOSE THE BRACKET MOTION, TO SUPPORT LR26CA, AND LET THE 18-YEAR-OLDS OF THE STATE VOTE ON WHETHER TO INCLUDE THIS IN THE CONSTITUTION. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR MURANTE. SENATOR WILLIAMS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR WILLIAMS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. AND I STAND IN SUPPORT OF THE BRACKET MOTION TODAY AND OPPOSED TO LR26CA. IT'S INTERESTING FOR ME. THE LAST TIME THAT WE TALKED ABOUT THIS ON GENERAL FILE, THE NEXT DAY AFTER THAT I HEADED BACK TO GOTHENBURG AND HAD A MEETING WITH 30 PEOPLE. THOSE 30 PEOPLE RANGED IN AGE FROM YOUNG EARLY 20s TO MY AGE AND A LITTLE BIT OLDER. AND I POSED THE QUESTION TO THEM AND I DID IT IN A WAY THAT LEFT DISCUSSION OUT OF IT, JUST SIMPLY, HOW WOULD YOU VOTE ON THIS KIND OF AN ISSUE? AND I HANDED OUT LITTLE SHEETS OF PAPER AND THEY WROTE THEIR VOTES DOWN. AND I, FOR ONCE, JUST WANTED TO LISTEN AND SEE WHAT THESE, WHO ARE MY CONSTITUENTS...BUT MORE LIKELY, THESE ARE PEOPLE THAT DO VOTE AND WOULD VOTE ON THIS IF WE WOULD HAPPEN TO BRING THIS AS A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. THIRTY PEOPLE VOTED. ONE CHOSE NOT TO VOTE. ONE VOTED IN FAVOR OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT. TWENTY-EIGHT WROTE ON THEIR LITTLE SHEETS, NO, AND ABOUT HALF A DOZEN OF THOSE WROTE H-E-L-L NO. THEN WE OPENED UP THE GROUP TO DISCUSSION OF WHY. AND THE OVERWHELMING REASON WAS, WHY DO WE NEED TO TRY TO FIX SOMETHING IN THE CONSTITUTION THAT'S NOT BROKEN? ARE WE LACKING CANDIDATES FOR THESE POSITIONS? ARE WE LACKING QUALIFIED CANDIDATES FOR THESE POSITIONS? TRYING TO MAKE THE ARGUMENT THAT VOTING, FOR INSTANCE, SHOULD BE EQUATED TO SERVING IN THE LEGISLATURE, THEY'RE TWO SEPARATE ISSUES. TRYING TO EQUATE THE FACT THAT SERVING IN THE ARMED SERVICES AND RISKING YOUR LIFE IS THE SAME ISSUE AS SERVING AS GOVERNOR OR LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR, AGAIN, ARE SEPARATE ISSUES. AGAIN, THE OVERRIDING ARGUMENT WAS THE LACK OF ANY PRESSING NEED. OUR CONSTITUTION IS THERE FOR A REASON. MESSING WITH IT CHANGES THINGS THAT WE MAY BETTER LEAVE ALONE. I'VE OFTEN SAID IF THAT PERSON AT 18 IS QUALIFIED AND CAPABLE OF SERVING IN THIS LEGISLATURE, THEY WILL BE A BETTER CANDIDATE WHEN THEY'RE 21. IF THERE'S A PERSON WHO IS QUALIFIED AND CAPABLE AND WANTS TO RUN FOR GOVERNOR WHEN THEY'RE 25, I BELIEVE THEY WILL BE A BETTER AND MORE QUALIFIED CANDIDATE WHEN THEY'RE 30. AND AGAIN WITH TERM LIMITS, EIGHT YEARS IN THE LEGISLATURE WILL GO VERY QUICKLY WHETHER THAT PERSON STARTS AT AGE 18 OR AGE 21. THE OLD SAYING USED TO BE GOOD JUDGMENT COMES FROM EXPERIENCE AND EXPERIENCE COMES FROM BAD JUDGMENT. I THINK WE NEED TO BE CAREFUL THAT WE ARE NOT EXHIBITING BAD JUDGMENT IN THE LEGISLATURE. PEOPLE EXPECT A GREAT DEAL OF US IN THIS BODY. THEY EXPECT US TO SIT IN THE

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

HEARINGS, TO MAKE JUDGMENTS, TO LISTEN TO ALL OF THE ARGUMENTS, AND THEN TO DO WHAT'S RIGHT AT THE END OF THE DAY. I SEE NO PRESSING NEED TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THIS. AND I SEE US EATING VALUABLE TIME THAT COULD BE BETTER SPENT ON TRYING TO SOLVE THOSE ISSUES OF PROPERTY TAX, SCHOOL FUNDING, AND OTHER THINGS OF VITAL IMPORTANCE TO THE FUTURE OF OUR STATE. THEREFORE, I STAND IN SUPPORT OF THE BRACKET MOTION. I APPRECIATE THE CONSTITUTIONAL ARGUMENTS THAT SENATOR MORFELD... [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR WILLIAMS: ...AND SENATOR SCHUMACHER HAVE HAD. I THINK THE AMENDMENT THAT SENATOR MORFELD HAS ADDED DOES TAKE AWAY THAT POSSIBILITY OF THIS BODY CREATING MORE QUALIFICATION RESTRICTIONS OR HOWEVER YOU'D LIKE TO TERM THAT FOR THESE JOBS. BUT THE BOTTOM LINE IS THAT EXPERIENCE, THOSE QUALIFICATIONS ARE IMPORTANT. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR WILLIAMS. (VISITORS INTRODUCED.) SENATOR BLOOMFIELD, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. THOSE ARE INTERESTING NUMBERS WE JUST HEARD, THAT 28 OUT OF 30 DIDN'T THINK THIS WAS A GOOD IDEA. THAT'S PRETTY CLOSE TO WHAT I'M FINDING AT HOME. EVEN THE 18-YEAR-OLDS DON'T WANT THIS. WE'RE GOING TO BE TOLD NOW THAT, WELL, LET'S PUT IT TO A VOTE AND LET THEM DECIDE. IF THAT IS OUR INTENT HERE, IF THAT IS WHAT WE'RE HERE FOR IS JUST TO PUT EVERYTHING TO A VOTE OF THE PEOPLE, WE JUST AS WELL PACK OUR BAGS AND GO HOME. THIS IS NOT A DIRECT DEMOCRACY. THIS IS A REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY. LET'S ACT AS THOUGH WE'RE REPRESENTATIVES OF WHAT THE PEOPLE WANT. LET'S NOT JUST THROW EVERYTHING OUT TO A VOTE OF THE PEOPLE. THE STATE DOES INDEED LET 18-YEAR-OLDS BE INVOLVED IN MODIFYING THE CONSTITUTION. THEY WILL DO SO WITH CONSULTATION OF PEOPLE THEIR AGE AND WITH MORE ADULT MEMBERS OF THEIR SOCIETAL GROUP WHEN THEY GO TO VOTE. THEY WILL NOT BE MAKING LIFE-AND-DEATH DECISIONS AS THE GOVERNOR UNDER THE WAY WE OPERATE NOW. WE DON'T GIVE THEM THAT AUTHORITY. THE STATE DOES NOT GIVE THEM THAT AUTHORITY. THEY ARE GIVEN THE RIGHT TO VOTE AND THEY CAN CONSULT WITH OTHERS. SENATOR LARSON TELLS US THAT THIS WHOLE IDEA OF DEFEATING THIS BILL IS JUST TO BURN TIME SO THAT WHEN WE

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

GET TO LB970 WE FEEL A LITTLE MORE STRESSED. SENATOR SCHUMACHER BACK THERE IS, IN MY MIND, THE FOREMOST PROPONENT OF LEGALIZED GAMING IN THE STATE OF NEBRASKA AND HE SEES ISSUES WITH THIS BILL. SO DO I. COLLEAGUES, IT LOOKS LIKE WE'RE IN FOR THE LONG HAUL ON THIS. THAT'S TOO BAD. THERE'S A LOT OF IMPORTANT STUFF TO GET TO. AND A LOT OF THINGS THAT WE REALLY SHOULDN'T HAVE TO SPEND THIS KIND OF TIME ON TO BE DECIDED. I'D YIELD THE REMAINDER OF MY TIME TO SENATOR CHAMBERS. [LR26CA LB970]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR BLOOMFIELD. SENATOR CHAMBERS, 2:00. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. THANK YOU, SENATOR BLOOMFIELD. I'D LIKE TO ASK SENATOR LARSON A QUESTION IF HE'S STILL ON THE PREMISES. [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: SENATOR LARSON, WOULD YOU YIELD, PLEASE? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: YES. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SENATOR LARSON, YOU MENTIONED A MAN NAMED ZUCKERBERG. AND AT WHAT AGE DID YOU SAY HE BECAME...WHAT DID YOU SAY? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: I BELIEVE I SAID 20, BUT I WAS...LOOKED IT UP. IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN 22 OR 23 WHEN HE MADE HIS FIRST BILLION. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: NOW, WHY DO YOU THINK I ASKED THAT QUESTION? BECAUSE I KNEW YOU WERE WRONG. BUT LET ME ASK YOU ANOTHER QUESTION. WHAT SCHOOL WAS HE ATTENDING WHEN HE MADE THIS LEAP...? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: HARVARD. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: HOW MANY 18-YEAR-OLDERS ARE IN HARVARD? [LR26CA]

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

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SENATOR LARSON: THE FRESHMEN CLASS AT HARVARD IS PROBABLY ABOUT 1,500, 2,000. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SO YOU SAY THAT THE FRESHMEN CLASS IN HARVARD COMPRISES PEOPLE 18 YEARS OLD. THAT'S YOUR VIEW? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: I DOUBT THERE'S VERY MANY SOPHOMORES. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: AND I'M NOT GOING TO QUIBBLE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: YEAH, YEAH. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I JUST WANT TO BE SURE THAT'S WHAT YOU'RE SAYING. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: YEAH, I WOULD SAY THAT A LOT OF THE FRESHMEN CLASS IS AROUND 18. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THAT'S NOT THE MAIN ISSUE. BUT OUT OF THAT GREAT NUMBER, HOW MANY BECAME A BILLIONAIRE THAT YOU KNOW OF? [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: OF MR. ZUCKERBERG'S CLASS, OR JUST...? [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THAT WHOLE FRESHMEN CLASS. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: OF SPECIFICALLY MR. ZUCKERBERG'S? PROBABLY JUST... [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: AND AFTER HIM. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: ...RIGHT NOW, JUST...I DON'T...I COULDN'T SAY FOR SURE. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SENATOR CHAMBERS: OKAY, THANK YOU. WE'RE TAKING TOO MUCH TIME. BUT I WANTED TO CORRECT THAT. WHAT MR. ZUCKERBERG DID IS THE EXCEPTION. WE PASS LAWS...AND I HATE TO ALWAYS GET BASIC BUT IT'S NECESSARY. WE PASS LAWS FOR THE GENERALITY--NOT FOR AN 18-YEAR-OLDER HERE, AN 18-YEAR-OLDER THERE, BUT FOR THE GENERAL RUN. THAT'S WHAT LAWMAKING IS ABOUT. THE SUPREME COURT EVEN SAYS THERE CAN BE NO SPECIAL LAWS. YOU HAVE TO HAVE GENERAL LAWS, LAWS THAT COVER THE GENERALITY. YOU CANNOT PASS A LAW AND IT BE CONSTITUTIONAL IF YOU CREATE A CLOSED CLASS, MEANING THESE ARE THE ONES AFFECTED BY THIS LAW... [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: TIME, SENATOR. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...AND NO NEW PEOPLE CAN ENTER IT. OH, YOU SAID TIME? THANK YOU. [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: TIME, BUT YOU ARE NEXT IN THE QUEUE, SENATOR. YOU MAY CONTINUE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. A CLOSED CLASS IS ONE WHICH, ONCE IT'S CREATED, THERE CAN BE NO NEW PARTIES JOINING IT. THAT'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL. THAT'S WHY YOU SET UP CLASSIFICATIONS OF CITIES BASED ON POPULATION SO THAT IF A CITY WHICH IS CLASS I COMPRISES 1,000 PEOPLE, AND A CLASS II COMPRISES 1,001 AND MORE, THE ONE IN THE LOWER CLASS BY NUMBER CAN BECOME A MEMBER OF THE OTHER CLASS BY INCREASING IN POPULATION. SOME PEOPLE ON THIS FLOOR DON'T EVEN UNDERSTAND HOW WE LEGISLATE. THEY WILL NOT READ. I HAVE NEVER SAID THAT WITH AGE ARE YOU GUARANTEED WISDOM. WE HAVE A YOUNG MAN NAMED SENATOR MURANTE AND HE MISSTATED. AND HE'S HEAD OF A COMMITTEE HERE. HE SAID 18-YEAR-OLDERS CAN CHANGE THE CONSTITUTION. NO, THEY CAN'T. THEY CAN PARTICIPATE. THEY CAN VOTE. BUT A MAJORITY OF THE PEOPLE IN THIS STATE WHO COULD VOTE TO ALTER THE CONSTITUTION ARE NOT 18 YEARS OLD. THE ONLY WAY YOU CAN MAKE THAT GENERAL STATEMENT IS IF THE GROUP YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT COMPRISES A LARGE ENOUGH NUMBER BY THEMSELVES TO ACHIEVE SOMETHING. EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLDERS DO NOT CHANGE THE CONSTITUTION. THEY DO NOT HAVE THE POWER TO CHANGE THE CONSTITUTION. THEY CAN VOTE ONE WAY OR THE OTHER, BUT THEY DON'T CHANGE THE CONSTITUTION. SO WE HAVE VERY CARELESS SPEAKERS ON THIS FLOOR AND MAYBE THAT'S DUE TO YOUTH. WHEN SENATOR MORFELD GOT HIS BILL WITH REFERENCE TO THESE YOUNG DRINKERS, WHAT

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

YOU'RE DEALING WITH IS THE CONCEPT OF CULPABILITY. TWO PEOPLE MAY COMMIT EXACTLY THE SAME ACT. BUT THERE IS NOT EQUAL CULPABILITY OR RESPONSIBILITY OR GUILT BECAUSE THERE ARE OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES THAT ARE TAKEN INTO THE JUDGMENT THAT'S TO BE FORMED. AND WHEN IT COMES TO THE DEATH PENALTY AND OTHER SERIOUS OFFENSES, AGE IS ONE OF THE THINGS THAT IS CONSIDERED. WE HAVE JUVENILE COURTS AND HAVE OTHER DISTINCTIONS BASED SOLELY AND STRICTLY ON AGE. SO FOR THESE PEOPLE ON THE FLOOR OF THE LEGISLATURE TO STAND UP AND TALK SOME OF THE NONSENSE THEY'RE TALKING INDICATES THAT BEING 18 IS NOT GOING TO ENSURE THAT YOU'RE CAPABLE, NOR BEING OVER 18 WILL ENSURE THAT. KNOWLEDGE DOES NOT COME TO US BY WAY OF OSMOSIS. WE APPLY OURSELVES, WE STUDY, WE MEDITATE, WE ANALYZE, WE THINK. AND AGE MAY PLAY A PART BECAUSE AFTER WE'VE BEEN HERE LONG ENOUGH, WE APPRECIATE THE VALUE OF KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING. WE REACH THE POINT WHERE WE KNOW WE ARE NOT INVINCIBLE. WE KNOW THAT THE LIFE THAT WE ARE PART OF HAS AN END. LIFE IS FINITE. IT'S GOING TO END. WHY DO YOU THINK YOUNG PEOPLE ARE DEVIL-MAY-CARE IN SO MANY SITUATIONS? THEY DON'T TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION THAT SOMETHING BAD CAN HAPPEN TO THEM. EVEN THE BIBLE SAID: OLD MEN FOR COUNCIL, YOUNG MEN FOR WAR. THAT'S IN THE BIBLE. ANYTHING YOU READ THAT YOU CONSIDER TO HAVE BEEN THE RESULT OF WISE, THOUGHTFUL PEOPLE WRITING IT, AGE IS SOMETHING THAT IS OFTEN DISCUSSED. AND TO SAY THAT SOMEHOW WE ARE DISRESPECTING YOUNG PEOPLE BECAUSE WE DON'T SAY THAT... [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...AT A CERTAIN AGE THEY HAVE THE MATURITY TO DO CERTAIN THINGS, IT'S A MISTAKE TO SAY THAT. THAT IS NOT DISRESPECT. THAT IS WHAT OUR AGE, THAT IS WHAT OUR WISDOM TEACHES US. THIS IS A BAD PROPOSAL. I'D LIKE TO ASK SENATOR LARSON...OH, HE'S TOO FAR AWAY. HE COULDN'T GET HERE IN TIME. BUT I WANT HIM TO TELL US WHO DRAFTED THIS BILL IN THE FIRST PLACE. OH, HE'S HERE. SENATOR LARSON, IF THERE'S TIME LEFT, WILL YOU TELL ME WHO DRAFTED THIS LR26CA? [LR26CA]

PRESIDENT FOLEY: SENATOR LARSON, WOULD YOU YIELD, PLEASE? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: YES. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: WHO DRAFTED THIS? [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SENATOR LARSON: MY LEGISLATIVE AIDE AND MYSELF. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. DO YOU AGREE THAT THERE WERE PROBLEMS WITH IT, MISTAKES MADE? [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: ESSENTIALLY, I DIDN'T...AFTER UNDERSTANDING THE LEGAL ANALYSIS THAT SENATOR MORFELD OFFERED... [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY PRESIDING [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: TIME. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: THANK YOU. [LR26CA]

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

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

SENATOR HANSEN: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I RISE TODAY IN SUPPORT OF LR26CA, SENATOR MORFELD'S AMENDMENT, AND IN OPPOSITION TO THE BRACKET MOTION. ONE THING THAT'S...BECAUSE IT'S COME UP BOTH IN GENERAL AND SELECT FILE AND EVEN SOME THIS MORNING, I WANTED TO ADDRESS, IS WE KEEP REFERENCING SENATOR MORFELD'S BILL DEALING WITH MINORS IN POSSESSION AND IMMUNITY AND CASES WITH THAT. I JUST WANT TO CLARIFY THAT'S A SITUATION IN WHICH WE'RE TREATING A SAY 19-YEAR-OLD AS AN ADULT WHO COULD BE CRIMINALLY CHARGED AS AN ADULT BUT WE'RE TREATING THEM DIFFERENT THAN OTHER ADULTS BECAUSE WE'RE SAYING THEY CAN'T POSSESS ALCOHOL. THAT IS A VERY SPECIAL CRIME, MINOR IN POSSESSION, WHERE YOU BOTH HAVE TO BE AN ADULT BUT NOT THIS OTHER CATEGORY OF ADULT. SO BY SAYING WE NEEDED SPECIAL LEGISLATION TO ADDRESS SERIOUS PUBLIC POLICY CONCERNS THAT YOUNG ADULTS WERE NOT SEEKING MEDICAL ATTENTION FOR FEAR OF CRIMINAL PROSECUTION IN MY MIND IS SEPARATE FROM THEIR OVERALL QUALIFICATIONS FROM OFFICE. SIMILARLY, WE'VE TALKED ABOUT THE STUDENT LOANS AND STUDENT LOAN RELIEF AS THE FACT THAT WE NEED...BILLS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED PROPOSING AND SUGGESTING THAT. I THINK THE ISSUE THAT STUDENT LOANS AND TUITION HAS BEEN INCREASING GREATER THAN INFLATION AND THAT THERE ARE

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SERIOUSLY CONCERNS OF HOW STUDENT LOANS AND THE TUITION BUBBLE ARE EVENTUALLY GOING TO AFFECT THE ECONOMY IS A SPECIAL DISCUSSION FOR WHETHER OR NOT YOU'RE QUALIFIED TO RUN FOR OFFICE. SO I UNDERSTAND THIS OPPOSITION TO THIS BILL. I UNDERSTAND THAT PEOPLE HAVE, SAY, SPECIFIC POLICY CONCERNS. I IMAGINE IF WE THREW UP AN AMENDMENT SAYING THE AGE FOR LEGISLATURE HAD TO BE 35, THAT WOULD PROBABLY GET SOME VOTES. I UNDERSTAND AND I APPRECIATE THAT WE CAN GO BACK AND FORTH ON WHAT AGE WE THINK IS APPROPRIATE TO HOLD PUBLIC OFFICE IN THE STATE OF NEBRASKA. MY POSITION, WHICH I SAID ON GENERAL FILE AND WHY I VOTED THIS OUT OF COMMITTEE AND WHY I AGREED TO SERVE AS A COSIGNER IS WE SHOULD HAVE A...WE SHOULDN'T HAVE STAGGERED POLITICAL RIGHTS, IS I GUESS THE WAY I SHOULD SAY IT. WE SHOULDN'T HAVE STAGGERED POLITICAL RIGHTS. IF WE'VE DECIDED THAT AT AGE OF 18 YOU CAN VOTE, YOU CAN RUN A CAMPAIGN, YOU CAN VOLUNTEER FOR A CAMPAIGN, YOU CAN DONATE TO A CAMPAIGN, YOU MIGHT BE ABLE TO LEAD THAT CAMPAIGN AS THE CANDIDATE. I THINK THERE SHOULD BE CONSISTENCY THERE. I UNDERSTAND THAT WE ARE GOING TO HAVE TO HAVE SOME ARBITRARY LINES IN TERMS OF AGE AND QUALIFICATIONS, WHICH LEADS ME TO THIS STORY. I HAD THIS OPPORTUNITY, BELIEVE IT WAS BEFORE SESSION. IT WAS BACK IN DECEMBER OR NOVEMBER WHERE I HAD A GROUP OF MIDDLE-SCHOOLERS FROM MY DISTRICT COME AND SPEAK AT THE CAPITOL. AND THEIR NUMBER ONE QUESTION FOR ME WAS, WHY COULDN'T SIXTH GRADERS VOTE? AND YOU KNOW, THAT WAS A TOUGH QUESTION. AND THEY WERE VERY PERSISTENT IN ASKING ME THAT QUESTION. AND I HAD TO TELL THEM THE TRUTH. I HAD TO TELL THEM THE TRUTH IS WE PICKED AN ARBITRARY LINE. WE PICKED AN ARBITRARY LINE, 18, BASED ON A LOT OF OUR PERCEPTIONS. AND THAT'S WHEN WE, AS A COUNTRY, DECIDED THEY HAD THE VOTE. AND THEY ASKED ME TO JUSTIFY THAT. AND I TOUCHED A LITTLE BIT ON THE HISTORICAL REASONS THE BEST I COULD OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD BUT, YOU KNOW, ULTIMATELY HAD TO CONCEDE THAT IT WAS, IN FACT, AN ARBITRARY LINE AND PROBABLY SOME OF THEM WERE SMART ENOUGH AND INFORMED ENOUGH TO BE ACTIVE IN THE POLITICAL PROCESS, IN TERMS OF VOTING. BUT WE, AS A POLICY, PROBABLY...AND I'M NOT SUGGESTING WE LOWERING THE VOTING AGE. BUT I GUESS THIS WHOLE STORY IS TO ILLUSTRATE THE IDEA OF THE ARBITRARY LINE. SO IF WE WANT TO SAY THE ARBITRARY LINE FOR VOTING IS ONE AGE, THE ARBITRARY LINE FOR RUNNING FOR ONE OFFICE IS ANOTHER, RUNNING IS A THIRD, I UNDERSTAND THAT. I DON'T THINK THAT'S DISRESPECTFUL. I DON'T QUESTION THE MOTIVES OF ANYBODY WHO'S OPPOSING THIS. I WILL SAY FOR ME, THOUGH, IF WE ARE GOING TO... [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR HANSEN: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT...IF WE ARE GOING TO HAVE THAT ARBITRARY LINE AND WE ARE GOING TO DECIDE POLITICAL RIGHTS, ESPECIALLY IMPORTANT POLITICAL RIGHTS LIKE VOTING, START AT A CERTAIN AGE, I THINK AN EQUIVALENT OF THAT SHOULD BE RUNNING FOR OFFICE. I MEAN WE ALL KNOW CANDIDATES AND, FRANKLY, CANDIDATES WHO PRESUMABLY KNOW THEMSELVES IS A LONG SHOT, WHO, AS THEIR WAY OF GETTING POLITICALLY INVOLVED, DECLARE FOR OFFICE. THEY MIGHT DECLARE FOR OFFICE EVERY YEAR AND EVERY YEAR AND THAT'S THEIR WAY OF GETTING THEIR VIEWPOINTS PRINTED IN THE NEWSPAPER. THAT'S THEIR WAY OF GETTING SOME ATTENTION TO THEIR ISSUES. I DON'T THINK THAT'S UNCOMMON. I THINK MANY OF US MIGHT HAVE HAD A PERSON IN THEIR RACE WHO FIT THAT CATEGORY. AND I THINK THAT SHOULD BE ALL NEBRASKANS' RIGHTS ONCE THEY'VE REACHED THE AGE TO VOTE. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR HANSEN. SENATOR MORFELD, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED, AND THIS IS YOUR THIRD TIME. [LR26CA]

SENATOR MORFELD: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I CERTAINLY APPRECIATE MY COLLEAGUE, MATT WILLIAMS' COMMENTS THAT HE MADE AND SOME OF THE PEOPLE THAT HE TALKED TO IN HIS DISTRICT. HOWEVER, TO MAKE THE ARGUMENT THAT, WELL, IF SOMETHING ISN'T BROKE, DON'T FIX IT, WELL, IT MAY NOT BE BROKE TO YOU, BUT TO SOME OF US, WE FEEL AS THOUGH IT IS BROKE. IT'S AN ISSUE OF FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS, THAT IF YOU HAVE...IF YOU'RE AN ADULT, YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO VOTE. BUT YET, YOU DON'T HAVE THE RIGHT TO REPRESENT THE PEOPLE THAT LIVE IN YOUR COMMUNITY, IN YOUR STATE, AND IT'S AN ISSUE OF FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS. IT'S AN ISSUE THAT MANY OF US IN THIS BODY FEEL AS THOUGH IT NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED. SO WHILE SOME PEOPLE MAY THINK THAT IT'S NOT BROKE, AND A LOT OF THOSE PEOPLE, I'M ASSUMING, ARE PROBABLY OVER THE AGE OF 21 AND ABLE TO RUN FOR OFFICE THEMSELVES, I THINK THERE'S SOME OF US HERE THAT BELIEVE THAT SOMETHING IS BROKEN AND THAT'S WHY WE'RE SUPPORTING LR26CA. IN TERMS OF LIFE EXPERIENCE, I KNOW THAT WHEN I TURNED THE AGE OF 18, BASED ON A LOT OF THINGS THAT HAPPENED IN MY LIFE AS A YOUNG PERSON, I PROBABLY HAD A LOT MORE LIFE EXPERIENCE THAT WAS A LITTLE BIT MORE RICH THAN SOME OF THE PEOPLE MAYBE IN THIS BODY. SO WHO'S TO SAY THAT AN 18-YEAR-OLD HASN'T HAD A WHOLE HOST OF DIFFERENT LIFE EXPERIENCES THAT BRINGS EXPERIENCE, BACKGROUND, AND A UNIQUE PERSPECTIVE ON THE VARIOUS ISSUES THAT WE ADDRESS IN THIS BODY? YOU

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

KNOW, AT THE AGE OF 30, IN RESPONSE TO SENATOR SCHNOOR'S ARGUMENT, I PROBABLY WOULDN'T BE A GENERAL. BUT I WENT DOOR-TO-DOOR, I WORKED HARD WHEN I TURNED 28, AND I CONVINCED ENOUGH PEOPLE IN MY DISTRICT-- FOR BETTER OR FOR WORSE FOR SOME OF YOU-- THAT I SHOULD BE DOWN IN THIS BODY REPRESENTING THEM. AND THAT'S OUR DEMOCRATIC PROCESS. IN RESPONSE TO SENATOR BLOOMFIELD'S ARGUMENT THAT WE'RE A REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY, YES, WE ARE A REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY. BUT WE ALSO HAVE A DIRECT DEMOCRACY COMPONENT. AND JUST BECAUSE WE HAVE A REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY COMPONENT DOESN'T MEAN THAT WE SHOULDN'T USE OUR DULY AUTHORIZED POWER TO INITIATE THE DEMOCRACY PROCESS WHICH IS WITHIN OUR PURVIEW AND WITHIN OUR CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS. ONE OF THE BIG ISSUES THAT WE FACE IN THIS STATE AND WE'RE CONSTANTLY TALKING ABOUT IS HOW TO REDUCE THE BRAIN DRAIN, HOW TO ATTRACT TALENT. NOW, GRANTED, I WON'T MAKE THE ARGUMENT THAT PEOPLE ARE GOING TO COME TO THE STATE OF NEBRASKA OR STAY HERE BECAUSE THEY CAN'T RUN FOR OFFICE WHEN THEY'RE 18 OR 19. THAT'S A BIT OF A STRETCH. BUT I WILL MAKE THE ARGUMENT THAT WE SHOULD VALUE OUR YOUNG PEOPLE. AND OUR ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER THAN OUR WORDS, THAT IF WE REALLY DO VALUE YOUNG PEOPLE STAYING IN THE STATE, WE VALUE THEIR TALENT, THEIR KNOWLEDGE, AND THEIR HARD WORK ETHIC, WE SHOULD MATCH THAT WITH ACTION AND SAY, LISTEN, IF YOU WANT TO WORK HARD AND YOU WANT TO GO OUT AND REACH OUT TO THE PEOPLE IN YOUR COMMUNITY AND PUT YOUR NAME OUT THERE TO RUN FOR OFFICE, YOU SHOULD BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO DO SO. AND YOUR CONSTITUENTS AND YOUR COMMUNITY MEMBERS SHOULD BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO DECIDE WHETHER OR NOT YOU'RE QUALIFIED TO DO SO. I ASK THAT YOU OPPOSE THE BRACKET MOTION AND SUPPORT LR26CA. THANK YOU. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR MORFELD. (VISITORS INTRODUCED.) SENATOR BRASCH, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR BRASCH: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN, AND THANK YOU, COLLEAGUES. WE DO VALUE OUR 18-YEAR-OLDS. AND WE DO WANT THEM TO HAVE IMPORTANT NEXT STEPS OF A VOCATION, FURTHER EDUCATION, LIFE EXPERIENCE, MILITARY SERVICE, AND THE LIST GOES ON. AND THAT IS WHY I DO OPPOSE LR26CA AND I DO SUPPORT THE BRACKET. I WOULD LIKE TO YIELD THE REST OF MY TIME TO SENATOR CHAMBERS. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE YIELDED 4:26. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, SENATOR BRASCH. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. THERE ARE SOME PEOPLE IN THIS BODY WHO HAVE READ HISTORY. THERE ARE SOME WHO STUDIED IT. THERE ARE OTHERS WHO HAVE HAD IT TOLD TO THEM. AT THE TIME THE U.S....I'D LIKE TO ASK SENATOR MURANTE A QUESTION OR TWO, NOT JUST BECAUSE HE'S UP THERE. BUT HE HAS WORKED WITH ELECTION MATTERS AND HE MIGHT BE BETTER ABLE TO ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS. AND THERE WON'T BE THAT MANY. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR MURANTE, WILL YOU YIELD TO A QUESTION? [LR26CA]

SENATOR MURANTE: I WOULD ABSOLUTELY LOVE TO, MR. CHAIRMAN. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SENATOR MURANTE, UNDER THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, WHAT'S THE MINIMUM AGE AT WHICH A PERSON CAN BE PRESIDENT? [LR26CA]

SENATOR MURANTE: CAN BE PRESIDENT? IT'S 35. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: AND A MEMBER OF CONGRESS? [LR26CA]

SENATOR MURANTE: CONGRESS IS 25. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, THE REASON I ASK THAT QUESTION, AND THE CONSTITUTION CAME INTO BEING IN...WELL, SOME YEARS AGO. THE LIFE EXPECTANCY WAS MUCH LOWER THEN THAN IT IS NOW. SO SOMEBODY 35 YEARS OLD AT THAT TIME, BASED ON THE LIFE EXPECTANCY, WAS CONSIDERED MORE SEASONED THAN WOULD BE THE CASE NOW. AS THE LIFE EXPECTANCY INCREASES, THE AGE OF 35 HAS LESS SIGNIFICANCE IN TERMS OF THE PERCENTAGE OF THE EXPECTED LIFE SPAN OF A PERSON. SO IF YOU WERE THOUGHT TO PERHAPS LIVE TO BE 45 YEARS OLD OR 48 YEARS OLD, AND YOU COULD NOT BE PRESIDENT UNTIL YOU WERE 35, YOU ARE BEYOND MIDDLE AGE, BASED ON THE LIFE EXPECTANCY. THERE WERE OLDER PEOPLE THAN THAT. I HEAR SO MANY THINGS BEING SAID OVER AND OVER AND OVER ABOUT SOME OUTSTANDING INDIVIDUAL. WELL, THAT EXCEPTION PROVES THE RULE. AND WHAT THAT MEANS IS THAT IF EVERYBODY IN THAT CLASS WERE OF THE SAME ABILITY AS THIS PERSON, THIS PERSON WOULD NOT BE EXCEPTIONAL. THIS PERSON IS EXCEPTIONAL BECAUSE HE OR SHE STANDS OUT FROM WHAT GENERALLY IS THE CASE. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

THERE ARE PEOPLE ON THIS FLOOR, AND MAYBE NOT JUST ON THIS FLOOR, WHO DON'T DEAL WITH YOUNG PEOPLE. I DO: THOSE WHO ARE CONSIDERED GOOD, THOSE WHO ARE CONSIDERED BAD, AND THOSE WHO ARE CONSIDERED IN BETWEEN. AND IT'S NOT HARD FOR ME TO ANSWER ANY QUESTION THAT A YOUNG PERSON ASKS ME. IF SOMEBODY 6 YEARS OLD ASKS ME WHY CAN'T SOMEBODY 6 YEARS OLD VOTE, OR 14 YEARS OLD, I WOULDN'T HAVE ANY PROBLEM ANSWERING IT AT ALL. I SAY, YOU GOT 14-YEAR-OLD FRIENDS? YEAH, I DO. I SAY, HOW MANY OF YOUR 14-YEAR-OLD FRIENDS WOULD YOU TRUST TO MAKE DECISIONS FOR AND ABOUT YOU? THEY SAY NONE OF THEM. WHEN YOU SPEAK IN THE ABSTRACT AND YOU DON'T DEAL WITH THE REALITY OUT THERE, YOU COME UP WITH ALL THESE FANCIFUL ANECDOTES THAT DON'T TOUCH THE REALITY. I FEEL AN OBLIGATION TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTION AND THE PROCESS. YEAR... [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...AFTER YEAR, THERE WERE ATTEMPTS MADE TO PUT HUNTING, TRAPPING, AND FISHING ON THE BALLOT TO HAVE IT PUT IN THE CONSTITUTION. AND I KEPT THAT OUT OF THE REALM WHERE PEOPLE WOULD VOTE FOR IT. AS SOON AS I WAS TERM LIMITED OUT, SENATOR PIRSCH GOT IT ON THE BALLOT AND THEY PUT HUNTING, TRAPPING, AND FISHING INTO THE CONSTITUTION, WHICH I FELT CLUTTERED IT, IT DEBASED IT, DEMEANED IT, AND TOOK AWAY FROM WHAT A CONSTITUTION IS AND THE PURPOSE IT SERVES. AT THIS POINT, I FEEL I'M SERVING THAT FUNCTION AGAIN. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR BRASCH AND SENATOR CHAMBERS. SENATOR FRIESEN, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR FRIESEN: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. I RISE IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION TO BRACKET. I'VE LISTENED TO MOST OF THE DEBATE THIS MORNING. AND YOU KNOW, TO INSINUATE THAT WE DON'T APPRECIATE OUR YOUNG PEOPLE OR RESPECT THEIR DECISIONS, I DON'T BUY INTO THAT. I LOOK AT THIS A LITTLE BIT AS LIKE, YOU KNOW, AGE 18 YET, I REMEMBER I STILL COULDN'T SUPPORT MYSELF. I WAS STILL VERY DEPENDENT UPON MY PARENTS. SO YOU GO TO COLLEGE NOWADAYS WHERE YOU'RE STILL DEPENDENT UPON SOMEONE. YOU HAVE NO STEADY JOB, NO INCOME. YOU'RE ALLOWED TO BE ON YOUR PARENTS' HEALTH INSURANCE UNTIL AGE 26. EVEN AT AGE OF 18, YOU CAN'T EVEN MAKE A DECISION TO HAVE A MEDICAL PROCEDURE DONE TO YOURSELF.

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

YOU GO TO THE DOCTOR AND YOU HAVE TO HAVE YOUR PARENTS SIGN OFF ON YOU TO. SO MAYBE (INAUDIBLE) HAS PARENTS SIGN OFF UNTIL 21, AND IF THEY AGREE THEN YOU CAN MOVE ON UP AND SERVE IN THE LEGISLATURE. I'LL YIELD THE REST OF MY TIME TO SENATOR CHAMBERS. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE YIELDED 3:50. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. THANK YOU, SENATOR FRIESEN. MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, A POINT CAN BE REACHED IN A DISCUSSION WHEN WE MUST...I MUST, SETTLE DOWN AND JUST BORINGLY OFFER WHAT MIGHT WOULD BE CONSIDERED A LECTURE IN ANOTHER SETTING. BUT WHETHER I SPEAK IN ANGRY TONES, MEASURED TONES, OR USE HUMOR, THE POINT DOES NOT CHANGE. THE LOGIC IS STILL THERE. BUT WHAT I THINK IS BEING IGNORED IS THAT THIS PROPOSAL WAS NOT PROPERLY DRAFTED IN THE FIRST PLACE BECAUSE THOSE DRAFTING IT DID NOT HAVE THE KNOWLEDGE REQUIRED TO DO IT. AND THEY DID NOT HAVE THE SEASONING TO CONSULT WITH THOSE WHO HAVE THE KNOWLEDGE. SO THEY PUT SOMETHING TOGETHER WHICH IS BEING CONSTANTLY AMENDED. YET, THERE ARE THOSE WHO ARE SUPPORTING IT IN ITS ORIGINAL FORM BECAUSE THEY DIDN'T KNOW. AND WHEN THE BLIND LEAD THE BLIND, THEY BOTH FALL IN THE DITCH. AND THAT'S SOMETHING JESUS SAID. HE SAID A LOT OF THINGS THAT PEOPLE ON THIS FLOOR DON'T KNOW BECAUSE THEY DON'T READ AND I DO. AND I KNOW THAT THE GENERALITY OF YOUNG PEOPLE IS SUCH THAT THEY DON'T READ. WHEN THEY ENTER THE UNIVERSITY, THEY DON'T KNOW WHAT THEIR MAJOR IS GOING TO BE. THEY DON'T EVEN KNOW WHAT A MAJOR IS. AND AS THEY PROCEED THROUGH THEIR COLLEGE TIME, THEY MAY CHANGE THAT MAJOR. THAT IS A PERIOD IN LIFE WHICH YOU COULD SAY IS IN FLUX, CHANGING, EVERYTHING IS CHANGING. THEY DON'T KNOW EVEN KNOW FOR SURE WHO THEY ARE AND THEY WILL OFTEN SAY WHO AM I? WHY AM I HERE? WHAT'S IT ALL ABOUT, ALFIE? WHO IS ALFIE? WHAT IS WHAT ABOUT? SOME PEOPLE CANNOT THINK BACK TO WHEN THEY WERE OF A CERTAIN AGE. AND I REMEMBER FAR MORE THAN PEOPLE MIGHT THINK I DO. AND I REMEMBER IN GREAT DETAIL WHAT HAPPENED TO ME IN MY LIFE AS I WAS GROWING UP BECAUSE OF THE COLOR OF MY SKIN AND THE THINGS THAT HAPPENED TO PEOPLE OF MY COLOR. AND I WANTED TO KNOW WHY, SO I DID A LOT OF READING. I DID A LOT OF LISTENING, A LOT OF DISCUSSING, AND A LOT OF THINKING. SO AT PERIODS IN MY LIFE, I REMEMBER VERY CLEARLY WHAT I WAS DOING AND WHAT I WAS THINKING. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: BUT DESPITE ALL THAT I WAS DOING AT THAT TIME, I CANNOT SAY THAT I KNEW ENOUGH TO BE ENTRUSTED WITH AN OFFICE LIKE THE LEGISLATURE. BUT WHEN I WAS IN HIGH SCHOOL AT TECH, WHICH WAS CONSIDERED A DUMB SCHOOL, I WOULD GET CALLS FROM THE MEDIA TO ANSWER QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PROBLEMS BLACK PEOPLE FACE AND I WAS A KID IN HIGH SCHOOL. AND THERE WERE ADULTS IN MY COMMUNITY WHO WOULD CALL ON ME. BUT MAYBE YOU COULD SAY I WAS EXCEPTIONAL. BUT THAT DOESN'T MEAN THAT BECAUSE I COULD DO WELL IN THESE AREAS THAT IT WAS LIKE THAT ACROSS THE BOARD WHERE LIFE AND LIVING ARE CONCERNED. AND EVEN AT THAT AGE, I HAD SENSE ENOUGH TO KNOW WHAT I KNEW AND WHAT I DIDN'T KNOW. BUT SINCE THERE'S NOT MUCH REQUIRED OF PEOPLE NOW, THEY SAY SOMEBODY 18 IS AS QUALIFIED TO DO THIS AS SOMEBODY 30. I DON'T KNOW... [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: TIME, SENATOR. [LR26CA]

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

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

SENATOR SCHNOOR: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. YOU KNOW, ONE OF THE ARGUMENTS WE'RE HEARING IS THAT WE'RE DISCRIMINATING AGAINST 18-YEAR-OLDS. SO, SENATOR CHAMBERS, I WAS WONDERING IF YOU WOULD YIELD TO A QUESTION, PLEASE. [LR26CA]

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

SENATOR CHAMBERS: YES, I WILL. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHNOOR: SENATOR CHAMBERS, WHAT'S THE COLOR OF YOUR SKIN? [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'M BLACK. WELL, THE ACTUAL COLOR IS BROWN, BUT I'M BLACK. THAT'S THE WAY I DESCRIBE IT. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SENATOR SCHNOOR: WELL, I WAS GOING TO SAY, YES, YOUR SKIN IS ACTUALLY BROWN. YEARS AGO WE MOVED TO NORTH CAROLINA INTO FAYETTEVILLE. AND I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE PERCENTAGE OF BLACK PEOPLE THAT LIVE THERE, BUT OUR KIDS WERE IN THE HOUSE AND WE WERE SAYING, HEY, DID YOU GO PLAY WITH THE NEIGHBORS? AND THEY SAID, WELL, WHICH ONES? AND I SAID, WELL, THE BLACK BOY NEXT DOOR. AND THEY WERE LOOKING AT ME LIKE I WAS NUTS. AND THEY SAID, THERE'S NO BLACK KID NEXT DOOR; HE'S BROWN. SO THE REALITY SET IN FOR ME ABOUT DISCRIMINATION AND HOW WE VIEW THINGS. BUT DO YOU VIEW THIS AS DISCRIMINATORY? [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: NO, NOT IN THE SENSE THAT THAT TERM USUALLY IS MADE...USED. THERE'S A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DISCRIMINATION AND DISTINCTION. DISTINCTIONS ARE VALID WHEN THEY'RE BASED ON LEGITIMATE DIFFERENCES OF CIRCUMSTANCE. DISCRIMINATION IS WHEN SOMEBODY IS UNFAIRLY AND UNREASONABLY DEPRIVED OF SOMETHING TO WHICH THEY'RE ENTITLED OR REQUIRED TO DO SOMETHING THAT EVERYBODY ELSE IS NOT. BUT TO MAKE VALID DISTINCTIONS DOES NOT CONSTITUTE DISCRIMINATION, IN MY OPINION. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHNOOR: YOU KNOW, WHEN I WAS IN THE MILITARY I FELT I WAS DISCRIMINATED AGAINST, NOT BECAUSE OF THE COLOR OF MY SKIN, OBVIOUSLY, BUT BECAUSE I WAS AN AIR FORCE GUY. ARMY UNITS WOULD SAY WE DON'T NEED YOU, WE CAN DO IT BETTER OURSELVES. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I AGREE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHNOOR: YEAH. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'M JUST KIDDING. (LAUGHTER) [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHNOOR: SO YOU KNOW, FROM A VERY SMALL PERSPECTIVE, I CAN KIND OF UNDERSTAND ABOUT DISCRIMINATION. BUT I DO NOT VIEW THIS AS DISCRIMINATORY EITHER. I DO NOT THINK WE ARE DISCRIMINATING AGAINST YOUNG PEOPLE. I JUST...AND THAT'S WHY I WANTED YOU TO ASK...ANSWER THOSE QUESTIONS FOR ME. I JUST VIEW THIS AS A LIFE EXPERIENCE THAT THE PEOPLE OF, YOU KNOW, 18 YEARS OLD JUST SHOULDN'T BE PUT IN THIS POSITION TO MAKE THOSE DECISIONS. AND I THINK WE AS A LEGISLATURE NEED TO ESTABLISH THAT RIGHT HERE. SO WITH THAT, I'LL YIELD THE REST OF MY TIME TO SENATOR CHAMBERS. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE YIELDED 2:25. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, SENATOR SCHNOOR. I WISH SENATOR KRIST WERE HERE BECAUSE HE COULD PROBABLY ANSWER THIS QUESTION. BUT I'M GOING TO ASK IT OF SENATOR MORFELD; HE MAY BE ABLE TO. [LR26CA]

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

SENATOR MORFELD: YES. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SENATOR MORFELD, CAN SOMEBODY 18 YEARS OLD GET A LICENSE TO PILOT A JUMBO JET? [LR26CA]

SENATOR MORFELD: I'M NOT SURE, TO BE HONEST WITH YOU, SENATOR CHAMBERS. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: OKAY, THANK YOU. [LR26CA]

SENATOR MORFELD: I WISH I HAD MORE LIFE EXPERIENCE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: BUT I DOUBT IT. I DOUBT IT. THERE ARE CERTAIN THINGS WHICH, IN DEALING WITH THE GENERALITY, SHOULD NOT BE PLACED IN THE HANDS OF VERY YOUNG PEOPLE. AND I WILL SAY THAT AND SAY IT. AND THE ONES WHO UNDERSTAND IT BEST ARE THE YOUNG PEOPLE THEMSELVES. AND I SAID, I'LL SAY IT AGAIN: ASK THEM, WOULD YOU WANT THESE PEOPLE THAT YOU RUN AROUND HERE WITH IN COLLEGE MAKING DECISIONS ABOUT YOUR LIFE? THEY BINGE DRINK. THEY'RE SHOWING THAT THERE ARE MORE SEXUAL ASSAULTS, SENATOR MORFELD, AND THEY'RE DOCUMENTING THEM. AND THE KINDS OF THINGS THAT OUGHT NOT TO OCCUR ARE OCCURRING TO A MUCH GREATER DEGREE ON UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES WHERE YOU HAVE YOUNG PEOPLE. IS THAT BECAUSE THEY'RE YOUNG? MAYBE IT'S THE ENVIRONMENT. WHATEVER IT IS... [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...YOU ARE NOT GOING TO FIND THAT GENERAL SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY WHEN YOU HAVE A LOT OF YOUNG PEOPLE DOING THINGS. I'M

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

GOING TO SEE SOME OF THESE VOTES THAT WE'VE TAKEN. WE'RE GOING TO TAKE SOME OF THEM IF THEY'VE GOT 33 VOTES, OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE, IF THERE ARE AT LEAST 17 VOTES WHO WILL VOTE FOR THINGS THAT I'M GOING TO OFFER. AND I ACKNOWLEDGE THAT I'M GOING TO RUN THE CLOCK AND MAKE THEM GET 33 VOTES AND THAT'S A PART OF THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS. WHAT SOME OF YOU DON'T KNOW, EVEN THOUGH I'VE TOUCHED ON IT, THEY CAN VOTE AT 18 IN THIS STATE BECAUSE SENATOR...FORMER SENATOR FROM SOUTH OMAHA, SENATOR HALL AND I MANAGED TO GET THAT ON THE BALLOT AND THE PEOPLE VOTED FOR IT. AND THERE WAS OPPOSITION TO IT, BUT I THOUGHT THEY SHOULD BE ABLE TO VOTE. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: TIME, SENATOR. [LR26CA]

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

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR SCHNOOR, AND THANK YOU, SENATOR CHAMBERS. SENATOR LARSON, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED, AND THIS IS YOUR THIRD TIME. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. A FEW THINGS THAT I WANT TO BRING BACK: WE HEAR FROM A LOT OF INDIVIDUALS IN THIS BODY, A LOT OF THEM THAT HAVE SPOKEN TODAY IN OPPOSITION TO LR26CA ABOUT THE WISDOM OF GEORGE NORRIS AND THE PEOPLE BEING THE SECOND HOUSE. WHEN GEORGE NORRIS ENVISIONED THIS UNICAMERAL, HE SET THE AGE AT 21 BECAUSE HE BELIEVED THAT IF YOU WERE OLD ENOUGH TO VOTE, YOU SHOULD BE OLD ENOUGH TO SERVE IN THE NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE. WHAT GEORGE NORRIS DIDN'T ENVISION WAS THAT...AND AT THAT TIME THE VOTING AGE WAS 21. WHAT GEORGE NORRIS DIDN'T ENVISION WAS THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT THAT WOULD LOWER THE AGE OF VOTING. UNFORTUNATELY, GEORGE NORRIS DIDN'T ALWAYS HAVE IT RIGHT. YOU CAN TALK ABOUT OUR SALARIES BEING IN THE CONSTITUTION AS WELL. IN HIS ATTEMPT TO ENSURE THE AGE OR ENSURE A HIGH-PAYING JOB. HE ACTUALLY HAMPERED THE CONSTITUTION...OR HAMPERED IT LATER ON. AND THAT'S WHAT WE'RE FACING NOW AND TRYING TO REMEDY IN LR26CA. WOULD SENATOR CHAMBERS YIELD TO A QUESTION? [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR... [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: CHAMBERS. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SPEAKER HADLEY: ...CHAMBERS, WILL YOU YIELD? [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: YES, I WILL. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU DISCUSSED THE U.S. CONSTITUTION BEING...TO RUN FOR THE U.S. HOUSE AT 25 AND PRESIDENT AT 35. AND YOU THOUGHT THE FOUNDERS DID...IS IT MY UNDERSTANDING, SO I CAN PHRASE IT IN A YES OR NO, IS IT MY UNDERSTANDING THAT YOU FEEL THAT THE FOUNDERS MADE VERY WISE DECISIONS WHEN THEY PUT THE AGES IN THE U.S. CONSTITUTION? [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I DIDN'T EVEN DISCUSS THE WISDOM. I WAS SAYING BECAUSE THE AGE...LIFE EXPECTANCY WAS LOWER, WHEN THEY PUT THAT AGE IN, IT WOULD BE A HIGHER PERCENTAGE OF THE LIFE EXPECTANCY THAN 21 IS OF A LIFE EXPECTANCY TODAY. THAT'S THE POINT I WAS MAKING. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: DO YOU THINK THE FOUNDERS WERE WISE TO PUT THE AGE IN? I'LL ASK JUST A YES-OR-NO QUESTION FOR YOU THEN. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: WELL, SINCE THE VAST MAJORITY WERE SLAVE HOLDERS, I DON'T THINK THEY WERE WISE AT ALL. [LR26CA]

SENATOR LARSON: THERE...THANK YOU...I...SENATOR CHAMBERS. HE BRINGS UP THE NEXT GREAT POINT. IF YOU'RE GOING TO USE THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AS THAT EXAMPLE, THAT THERE'S AGES IN THERE, HE'S RIGHT. THEY WEREN'T NECESSARILY WISE BECAUSE I'M SURE HE COULD HAVE GUESSED THE NEXT QUESTION I'D ASK IN TERMS OF WHO HAD THE RIGHT TO VOTE. AND THAT WAS WRONG OF THEM TO DO. AND WHAT THEY PUT IN THE CONSTITUTION IN TERMS OF COUNTING CENSUS POPULATION, AGAIN WRONG. THIS IS A STRAIGHT DISENFRANCHISEMENT OF INDIVIDUALS, AS WAS THAT IN OUR U.S. CONSTITUTION. WE SHOULD NOT DISCRIMINATE ON RACE, SEX, OR AGE WHEN IT COMES TO THE ABILITY TO REPRESENT AND VOTE. YOU SHOULD NOT. AND RIGHT NOW THE STATE OF NEBRASKA DOES DISCRIMINATE ON ONE OF THOSE FRONTS. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SENATOR LARSON: IT'S AS SIMPLE AS THAT. AND YOU WANT TO SAY THAT WE SHOULDN'T DISCRIMINATE ON X, Y, OR Z, AND WE'RE GOING TO HAVE ONE OF THOSE BILLS COME UP, BUT YOU'RE WILLING TO DISCRIMINATE HERE. THAT'S WRONG. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

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

SENATOR HANSEN: CALL THE QUESTION. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THE QUESTION HAS BEEN CALLED. DO I SEE FIVE HANDS? I DO. THE QUESTION IS, SHALL DEBATE CEASE? ALL THOSE IN FAVOR VOTE AYE; ALL THOSE OPPOSED VOTE NAY. THERE'S BEEN A REQUEST FOR A CALL OF THE HOUSE. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY VOTING AYE; OPPOSED VOTE NAY. RECORD, MR. CLERK. [LR26CA]

CLERK: 22 AYES, 0 NAYS, MR. PRESIDENT, TO PLACE THE HOUSE UNDER CALL. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THE HOUSE IS UNDER CALL. SENATORS, PLEASE RECORD YOUR PRESENCE. THOSE UNEXCUSED SENATORS OUTSIDE THE CHAMBER PLEASE RETURN TO THE CHAMBER AND RECORD YOUR PRESENCE. ALL UNAUTHORIZED PERSONNEL PLEASE LEAVE THE FLOOR. THE HOUSE IS UNDER CALL. SENATORS WATERMEIER, SCHEER, SCHNOOR, PANSING BROOKS, BOLZ, BURKE HARR, CRAWFORD, KOLOWSKI, KINTNER, JOHNSON. SENATORS BURKE HARR, SENATORS PANSING BROOKS, SENATOR SCHNOOR, THE HOUSE IS UNDER CALL. PLEASE RETURN TO THE CHAMBER. OKAY. SENATOR HANSEN, WILL YOU ACCEPT CALL-INS? OKAY, THE QUESTION IS, SHALL DEBATE CEASE? [LR26CA]

CLERK: SENATOR COASH VOTING YES. SENATOR SMITH VOTING YES. SENATOR KRIST VOTING YES. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: RECORD, MR. CLERK. [LR26CA]

CLERK: 25 AYES, 3 NAYS TO CEASE DEBATE, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: DEBATE DOES CEASE. SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED TO CLOSE. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, THIS IS A VOTE TO BRACKET THIS BILL UNTIL APRIL 20 OF THIS YEAR, WHICH WOULD MEAN IT'S OFF THE AGENDA FOR THE REST OF THE SESSION. I WOULD LIKE TO ASK SENATOR KRIST A QUESTION IF HE WILL YIELD. [LR26CA]

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

SENATOR KRIST: YES. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: SENATOR KRIST, DO YOU THINK THAT AN 18-YEAR-OLDER COULD GET A LICENSE TO FLY A JUMBO JET PASSENGER PLANE COMMERCIALY? [LR26CA]

SENATOR KRIST: IT WOULD TAKE LONGER THAN 18 YEARS OF LIFE TO EARN THE CERTIFICATES, GAIN THE TIME, EXPERIENCE, AND ACHIEVE AN AIR TRANSPORT PILOT LICENSE AND A COMMERCIAL LICENSE THAT WOULD ALLOW A PERSON TO FLY COMMERCIALY ON A JUMBO JET. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. NOW, MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, WHO'S GOING TO SAY THAT THAT'S AGE DISCRIMINATION? THERE'S SOME THINGS WE OUGHT TO HAVE SENSE ENOUGH TO UNDERSTAND. ALL THESE ARGUMENTS ABOUT AGE DISCRIMINATION, SAYING THAT THERE'S SOME OUTSTANDING YOUNG PEOPLE IS TOTALLY OFF OF THE MARK. AND THEY HAVE TO ARGUE THAT WAY BECAUSE THEY CANNOT STAY ON POINT IN TERMS OF WHAT IS EXPECTED OF SOMEBODY HOLDING ELECTIVE OFFICE. THIS STATE DID NOT AUTOMATICALLY ALLOW 18-YEAR-OLDERS TO VOTE, EVEN IF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PASSED A LAW LOWERING THE AGE TO 18, BECAUSE THEY WOULD LOWER IT WITH REFERENCE TO FEDERAL ELECTIONS, NOT STATE ELECTIONS. THERE ARE SO MANY THINGS THAT PEOPLE ASSUME, BUT THEY ARE NOT TRUE. KNOWLEDGE IS LACKING. IF WE COULD THINK WITH GREATER PRECISION, IF WE WOULD TAKE THE TIME TO RECOLLECT WHAT WE WERE BEING TAUGHT IN WHAT WAS CALLED CIVICS WHEN I WENT TO SCHOOL, WE WOULD ALL BE BETTER SERVED. BUT THERE'S A PROFOUND DISRESPECT FOR THE STATE CONSTITUTION, FOR THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION. AND I DON'T MEAN THE GOVERNMENT IS TOO BIG OR ANY OF THOSE KIND OF IDEOLOGICAL NOTIONS BUT AN UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT A CONSTITUTION IS AND THE ROLE IT IS TO SERVE. SO SOMEBODY, IT WOULD BE GOOD IF THERE WERE SOMEBODIES, PLURAL, NEED TO TRY TO PROTECT THE INTEGRITY OF THE

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

CONSTITUTION. WHEN SENATOR LARSON AND I TOUCHED BRIEFLY ON VOTING AND HE MENTIONED DISFRANCHISEMENT...BY THE WAY, PEOPLE SAY DISENFRANCHISE. IT'S NOT DISENFRANCHISE. IT'S DISFRANCHISE. IT'S "DISFRAN." AND I SHUDDER EVERY TIME I HEAR DISENFRANCHISE, JUST LIKE I CRINGE EVERY TIME I HEAR "NUCULAR." EVERY TIME I HEAR "NUCULAR" I SHUDDER. AND WHEN I HEAR PEOPLE SAY PREVENTIVE, WHEN IT'S REALLY PREVENTATIVE; WHEN I HEAR PEOPLE REFER TO FOOD AS HEALTHY, WHEN IT SHOULD BE HEALTHFUL. PEOPLE ARE HEALTHY; FOOD IS HEALTHFUL. IT PRODUCES OR GENERATES HEALTH. THERE ARE A LOT OF THINGS THAT MAKE ME CRINGE, BUT THEY'RE NOT OF GREAT CONSEQUENCE BECAUSE PEOPLE ARE ABLE TO MISPRONOUNCE AND NEVERTHELESS COMMUNICATE WHAT THEY WANT TO COMMUNICATE. AND THE PURPOSE OF COMMUNICATION IS TO ARRIVE AT AN UNDERSTANDING. BUT WHEN IT COMES TO A CONSTITUTION, IT GOES BEYOND JUST THE EXPRESSION OF AN OPINION. AND WE SHOULD NOT WILLY-NILLY PUT THINGS OUT THERE TO THE PUBLIC WHEN WE HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY AND AN OBLIGATION TO MAKE DECISIONS. THAT'S WHAT WE ARE TO DO. COURTS ARE IN A MORE BINDING SITUATION THAN WE ARE BECAUSE EVERY TIME A COURT IS PRESENTED WITH AN ISSUE,... [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...IT MUST DECIDE ONE WAY OR THE OTHER. IT MUST MAKE A DECISION. WE DON'T HAVE TO, BUT THERE ARE DECISIONS WE OUGHT TO. AND IN THIS CASE, I THINK THIS PROPOSAL GOES CONTRARY TO WHAT WE OUGHT TO BE DOING AS A LEGISLATURE. I DON'T THINK THERE WOULD BE ENOUGH VOTES TO BRACKET THIS BILL, BUT I MADE IT CLEAR AT THE OUTSET WHAT MY INTENT IS: TO FORCE THEM ULTIMATELY TO GET 33 VOTES. SO THAT'S WHAT I INTEND TO DO. I WILL NOT GET TIRED. I WILL NOT YIELD AS LONG AS I FEEL THAT THE CONSTITUTION IS NOT BEING PROPERLY RESPECTED AND WE ARE NOT DOING OUR DUTY. BASED ON WHAT I THINK,... [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: TIME, SENATOR. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...I WILL DO WHAT I THINK IS NECESSARY. MR. PRESIDENT, SINCE WE'RE UNDER CALL, COULD I ASK FOR A CHECK-IN? [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THERE'S BEEN A REQUEST FOR A CHECK-IN. PRESS YOUR GREEN BUTTON. SENATOR GROENE, WOULD YOU CHECK IN. SENATOR PANSING

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

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

BROOKS, WOULD YOU CHECK IN. SENATOR BAKER, SENATOR MELLO. ALL HAVE CHECKED IN, SENATOR. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'LL TAKE A MACHINE VOTE. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THE QUESTION BEFORE THE BODY IS TO BRACKET LR26CA UNTIL 4/20/16. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY VOTING AYE; OPPOSED VOTE NAY. HAVE ALL VOTED THAT WISH? A RECORD VOTE HAS BEEN REQUESTED. RECORD, MR. CLERK. [LR26CA]

CLERK: (RECORD VOTE READ, LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGE 590.) 14 AYES, 17 NAYS, MR. PRESIDENT, ON THE MOTION TO BRACKET. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THE BRACKET MOTION FAILS. MR. CLERK FOR ITEMS. RAISE THE CALL. [LR26CA]

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, BEFORE WE PROCEED, I DO HAVE SOME ITEMS, THANK YOU. A SERIES OF AMENDMENTS FROM SENATOR McCOY TO LB1032 AND TO LB472; SENATOR SCHUMACHER, AN AMENDMENT TO LB188; ALL THOSE TO BE PRINTED. YOUR COMMITTEE...NOTICE OF HEARING, GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE. YOUR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REPORTS LB823, LB1109 TO GENERAL FILE. URBAN AFFAIRS REPORTS LB865, GENERAL FILE; LB1059, GENERAL FILE WITH AMENDMENTS; LB1042, INDEFINITELY POSTPONED; LIKewise LR394CA; LR399CA. EDUCATION REPORTS LB1002 AND LB1086 TO GENERAL FILE AND LB906 TO GENERAL FILE WITH AMENDMENTS. PRIORITY BILL DESIGNATIONS: SENATOR KOLOWSKI, LB344; APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, LB1092 AND LB1093; SENATOR COOK, LB83; AND JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, LB894 AND LB910. MR. PRESIDENT, THAT'S ALL THAT I HAVE. THANK YOU. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGES 590-598.) [LB1032 LB472 LB188 LB823 LB1109 LB865 LB1059 LB1042 LR394CA LR399CA LB1002 LB1086 LB906 LB344 LB1092 LB1093 LB83 LB894 LB910]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, MR. CLERK.

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, RETURNING TO LR26CA, SENATOR CHAMBERS WOULD MOVE TO RECONSIDER THE VOTE TAKEN WITH RESPECT TO THE BRACKET MOTION. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

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

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. AND ONE OF MY COLLEAGUES MADE ME AWARE OF THE FACT THAT IT WAS HERMAN'S HERMITS...ANYWAY HERMAN'S HERMITS WHO SANG THAT SONG "HENRY VIII." BUT SECOND VERSE, SAME AS THE FIRST; THIRD VERSE, SAME AS THE FIRST; AND THAT WAS THE EQUIVALENT, IN MERRY OLD ENGLAND, OF A HUNDRED "BOTTLES OF BEER" ON THE WALL. AND THAT'S HOW THE SONG CAME TO BE, AND IT WENT ON AND ON AND ON. WELL, THIS IS SOMETHING THAT I WILL STAY ON AND THEY'RE GOING TO NEED 33 VOTES. THEY'VE GOT 17 ON THEIR SIDE. SO I WILL CONSIDER THE WORD "CLOTURE" TO BE TIPPERARY. AND I CAN TELL THEM, "IT'S A LONG, LONG WAY TO TIPPERARY." YOU HAVE 17 VOTES. I BELIEVE THAT THERE ARE SENATORS WHO ARE HAVING SECOND THOUGHTS ABOUT THIS ENTIRE PROPOSITION. TIME IS NEEDED TO MAKE IT CLEAR WHAT IT IS THAT WE'RE DOING. I'M GOING TO TAKE THE TIME. BUT I'M NOT SPEAKING NOW ONLY IN TERMS OF THE TIME TAKEN ON THIS PARTICULAR BILL THAT WILL LEAVE LESS TIME FOR OTHERS, BUT THINK ABOUT THE CONSTITUTION. WE AS THE LEGISLATURE SHOULD BE VERY CAREFUL AND CAUTIOUS ABOUT THE KINDS OF THINGS WE SUBMIT TO THE PUBLIC FOR THE PURPOSE OF ALLOWING THEM TO CHANGE THE CONSTITUTION. THAT'S WHAT WE'RE DOING, IN ADDITION TO NOT ASSUMING OUR DUTY AND RESPONSIBILITY TO EXERCISE GOOD JUDGMENT. WE SHOULD THINK MORE OF THE CONSTITUTION THAN TO TAKE ANY FLY-BY-NIGHT, ANY FADDISH SCHEME AND SAY, WELL, LET THE PEOPLE VOTE ON IT. ALEXANDER HAMILTON SAID THE PEOPLE ARE A GREAT BEAST, SADDLED, BRIDLED, AND WAITING TO BE RIDDEN. PEOPLE CAN USE THE TERM "PEOPLE" AND ASCRIBE TO THAT AMORPHOUS COLLECTION SUPER WISDOM, SUPER INTELLIGENCE. BUT IN THE REAL WORLD, THAT DOES NOT PLAY OUT. YOU DON'T TURN VERY IMPORTANT DECISIONS OVER TO, QUOTE, THE PEOPLE. YOU HAVE A SYSTEM, WHICH IS POSSIBLE TO FUNCTION IN A WAY WHERE THE WISEST, MOST INTELLIGENT, DEDICATED PEOPLE WILL HOLD THE REINS OF POWER AND AUTHORITY. THAT DOES NOT ALWAYS BE THE WAY IT PLAYS OUT, BUT THE SYSTEM IS SUCH THAT IT'S POSSIBLE. YOU COME CLOSER TO ACHIEVING THAT END IF YOU PROVIDE GOOD EDUCATION. AND UNFORTUNATELY, WHETHER THE SCHOOLS BE HOME, PUBLIC, CHARTER, OR PRIVATE, THE TYPE OF EDUCATION NEEDED FOR A COUNTRY THAT CALLS ITSELF A DEMOCRACY IS NOT FORTHCOMING. WHEN AT THE UNIVERSITY LEVEL YOU MUST HAVE REMEDIAL COURSES, SOMETHING IS WRONG. THINK OF HOW MANY YEARS A PERSON SPENDS BECOMING EDUCATED, SUPPOSEDLY, BEFORE HE OR SHE ENTERS THE UNIVERSITY, AND YET REMEDIAL COURSES ARE NEEDED.

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

THEY EVEN HAVE WHAT THEY CALL REMEDIAL ENGLISH AND THAT IS NOT FOR PEOPLE TO WHOM ENGLISH IS A SECOND LANGUAGE IN THE STRICT SENSE OF THE TERM. BUT IT IS REMEDIAL BECAUSE THE PEOPLE WHOSE NATIVE TONGUE IT IS IN THIS COUNTRY DON'T KNOW THE RULES THAT GOVERN ITS USE, ITS CONSTRUCTION. WHEN HAVE YOU EVER TAKEN A COURSE WHEN THEY TAUGHT YOU IN DEPTH ABOUT EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION, THE NEED TO BE CLEAR IN WHAT YOU SAY? THERE SHOULD BE AN ENCOURAGEMENT IN SCHOOL FOR PEOPLE TO DEVELOP A BROAD, WIDE-RANGING VOCABULARY BECAUSE, WHETHER YOU KNOW IT OR NOT, THOUGHT IS CARRIED ON BY MEANS OF WORDS. THE MORE WORDS YOU HAVE MASTERED, THE MORE CLEARLY YOU THINK, THE MORE PRECISE YOUR THINKING IS. IF YOU KNOW THREE WORDS, THAT'S ALL THE THINKING THAT YOU CAN DO. I'VE SAID THIS BEFORE AND I'LL SAY IT AGAIN. THERE WAS A GUY WHO ALLEGEDLY SAID MY KINGDOM FOR A HORSE. IF I HAD A KINGDOM, I WOULD SAY MY KINGDOM FOR NUANCED THINKING. TOO OFTEN IN THIS COUNTRY, PEOPLE THINK IN CLICHES AND THEY SPEAK IN SLOGANS. THAT'S WHY SOMEBODY LIKE DONALD TRUMP IS SO SUCCESSFUL. BUT NOW I'M GOING TO LET YOU IN ON A SECRET. I TOLD DONALD I WOULDN'T TELL ANYBODY. BUT SOME SECRETS ARE TOO GOOD TO KEEP AND IN MOST CASES, I WILL KEEP A SECRET BETTER THAN THE ONE TELLING ME. AND SOMEBODY ASKED ME, CAN I KEEP A SECRET? I SAID I'LL KEEP IT BETTER THAN YOU. AND WHEN THE PERSON SAID WHAT DO YOU MEAN? I SAID YOU'LL TELL ME, BUT I WON'T TELL ANYBODY. BUT THIS IS TOO GOOD TO KEEP. DONALD TRUMP IS AN UNDERCOVER DEMOCRAT. YOU KNOW THE KIND OF POLICIES THAT HE HAS SUPPORTED ALL OF HIS LIFE. HE REMAINS GOOD FRIENDS WITH THE CLINTONS, BUT TO KEEP YOUR ATTENTION DISTRACTED, HE SAYS HE'S A REPUBLICAN. AND HE DOESN'T CARE IF PEOPLE SAY HE'S NOT THE KIND OF REPUBLICAN THAT THEY WANT. WHAT HAS HE SUCCEEDED IN DOING? WHAT DID A KAMIKAZE PILOT SUCCEED IN DOING? WHAT DOES ONE OF THOSE BOMBERS WHO IS WILLING TO COMMIT SUICIDE ACHIEVE? DESTRUCTION OF A TARGET. HE IS THE BOMB THAT IS WITHIN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY DESTROYING IT. HE IS DOING THE WORK HE WAS SENT TO DO. ALL OF THE CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT ARE NOW FIGHTING EACH OTHER. THEY HAVE SPLIT THE VOTING BASE. THEY'RE AT EACH OTHER'S THROAT. HAD HE IDENTIFIED HIMSELF AS A DEMOCRAT, NOBODY WOULD EVEN TAKE HIM SERIOUSLY. BUT HE IS SO GOOD AT WHAT HE DOES, WHICH IS SHOWMANSHIP, SLEIGHT OF HAND, THAT THEY DON'T EVEN SEE AND UNDERSTAND WHAT HE'S DOING. WHO COULD HAVE CREATED THE DESTRUCTIVENESS WITHIN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY THAT DONALD TRUMP HAS SUCCEEDED IN DOING? AND THAT'S WHY HE HAS SO MUCH FUN. HIS FAVORITE EXPRESSIONS ARE THAT DISMISSIVE, JUST SPREADING HIS HANDS AND MAKING ONE OF THOSE EXPRESSIONS LIKE YOU DON'T EVEN MERIT A

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

RESPONSE. I'M NOT GOING TO RESPOND TO THAT. HE LOOKS AT ONE GUY, HE SAYS, MR. (INAUDIBLE), YOU'RE A BIG LIAR AND I'M RUNNING FOR PRESIDENT. YOU'RE A LIAR. IN FACT, YOU'RE A BIGGER LIAR AND THAN THAT LIAR OVER THERE. YEAH, I'M RUNNING FOR PRESIDENT. WHAT YOU GOING TO DO ABOUT IT? YOU THINK YOU'RE GOING TO BEAT THE DEMOCRAT? YOU CAN'T EVEN BEAT ME. I CAN USE PROFANITY. I CAN SAY ANYTHING I WANT TO. I CAN STAND IN THE MIDDLE OF FIFTH AVENUE AND SHOOT SOMEBODY AND I WON'T LOSE A VOTE. HE'S SMART. HE'S SMARTER THAN THE REPUBLICANS. HE'S DOING SOMETHING THAT NO DEMOCRATIC OR COLLECTION OF DEMOCRATS COULD DO. AND THEY'RE GOING TO FIGHT AND SCRAP ALL THE WAY TO THE END OF THIS SEASON AND I'M ENJOYING IT TO THE HIGHEST. GOOD OLD DONALD. AND I'M WRITING AN EPIC POEM AS IT GOES ALONG AND TRUMP IS THE WORD THAT EVERYTHING WILL RHYME WITH. THE FIRST LINE...FOUR-LINE STANZAS. THE FIRST LINE WILL RHYME WITH TRUMP; THE SECOND LINE WILL RHYME WITH TRUMP. THEN I CAN USE ANYTHING I WANT TO IN THE SECOND...IN THIRD AND THE...SECOND AND FOURTH--FIRST AND THIRD WILL BE HIM, SECOND AND FOURTH. AND IT'S A LOT OF FUN. BUT WHEN WE COME DOWN TO THE REALITY OF WHAT WE OUGHT TO DO, THERE SHOULD BE MORE RESPECT FOR THE CONSTITUTION. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: AND TO SHOW THEY HAVE NO RESPECT, THE PRESIDENT IS OBLIGED BY THE CONSTITUTION TO NOMINATE SOMEBODY WHEN THERE IS A VACANCY ON THE SUPREME COURT. AND THESE "REPELICANS" RUNNING FOR OFFICE WHO SAY THEY RESPECT...NOT REHNQUIST, SCALIA, BECAUSE HE SAID TAKE THE CONSTITUTION AS IT IS, THEY'RE DISREGARDING THE CONSTITUTION AS IT IS. AND TRUMP IS RESPONSIBLE FOR A LOT OF THAT. HE IS A BEWILDERER, A BEWITCHER, AND A "BEBOTHERER." THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: YOU'VE HEARD THE OPENING ON THE MOTION TO RECONSIDER. SENATOR GROENE, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR GROENE: THANK YOU, SPEAKER. I'D LIKE TO REMIND FOLKS THAT, MY FELLOW SENATORS, I'M ON THE GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE. NOBODY SHOWED UP IN SUPPORT OF THIS LR--NOT ONE 18-YEAR-OLD, NOT ONE 19-YEAR-OLD, NOT ONE 20, NOT ONE CIVICS TEACHER OR SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHER CAME IN AND SAID THIS WOULD BE A GREAT IDEA. I HEARD TALK ABOUT DISCRIMINATION, COMPARING THIS TO THOSE WHO CANNOT DEFEND THEMSELVES. I KNOW THIS

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

BODY MANY TIMES HAS...WE PASS LEGISLATION TO PROTECT THOSE WHO CANNOT DEFEND THEMSELVES: THE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED, THE ELDERLY THAT HAVE FOUND THEMSELVES MENTALLY IMPAIRED. WE HAVE A GUARDIAN SYSTEM THAT WAS PASSED HERE NOT TOO LONG AGO. ARE YOU COMPARING 18-YEAR-OLDS TO THAT, 19- AND 20-YEAR-OLDS TO THOSE FOLKS, THAT THEY CAN'T DEFEND THEMSELVES? THEY CAN'T STAND UP FOR THEMSELVES? I'VE BEEN INVOLVED IN PETITION DRIVES TO PUT THINGS ON THE BALLOT. IF 18- AND 19- AND 20-YEAR-OLDS ARE PASSIONATE ABOUT THIS, WHICH MOST OF THEM I KNOW HAVE MORE WISDOM THAN YOU GIVE THEM CREDIT FOR, THEY KNOW THEY'RE NOT READY FOR THIS. THEY COULD GO OUT AND HAVE A PETITION DRIVE AND PUT THIS ON THE BALLOT. THEY DON'T CARE. NOT ONE SHOWED UP TO THE HEARING. SENATOR CHAMBERS SAID...ASKED WHERE DID THIS COME FROM? WELL, IT WASN'T WRITTEN BY AN 18-YEAR-OLD. IT WASN'T WRITTEN BY A 19-YEAR-OLD. IT WASN'T ASKED FOR BY AN 18-YEAR-OLD OR A 19-YEAR-OLD. SO I GUESS WE ARE COMPARING THEM TO THE MENTALLY IMPAIRED AND OTHERS WHO CANNOT DEFEND THEMSELVES BECAUSE WE AS A BODY HAS TO LOOK AFTER THEM. THE AGE OF MAJORITY IN NEBRASKA IS 18...IS 19 ACTUALLY. AN 18-YEAR-OLD CAN'T SUE IN A COURT OF LAW. AN 18-YEAR-OLD CANNOT DEFEND THEMSELVES. WHEN THE JUDGE ASKS DO YOU HAVE AN ATTORNEY, AND THEY SAY I WANT TO DEFEND MYSELF, AN 18-YEAR-OLD CANNOT DO THAT. THEIR PARENTS MAKE THAT DECISION. AS I SAID LAST TIME WE DEBATED THIS, IF A 18-YEAR-OLD WAS A SENATOR AND FELL ON THESE STEPS, WE COULD NOT CALL A DOCTOR OR AN AMBULANCE. WE WOULD HAVE TO CONTACT THEIR PARENTS, AND THEIR PARENTS WOULD TELL YOU WHICH HOSPITAL AND WHICH DOCTOR TO TAKE THEM TO, BECAUSE THEY HAVE NOT REACHED THE AGE OF MAJORITY. I'D LIKE TO READ SOMETHING FROM OUR FOUNDING FATHERS. MADISON MADE THIS QUOTE ON JUNE 26 DURING THE CONVENTION YEAR. HE MOVED TO INSERT THE 25 YEARS OLD OF AGE AS A QUALIFICATION FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE FIRST BRANCH, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. HE THOUGHT IT ABSURD THAT A MAN TODAY SHOULD NOT PERMITTED BY THE LAW TO MAKE A CONTRACT FOR HIMSELF AND TOMORROW SHOULD BE AUTHORIZED TO MANAGE THE AFFAIRS OF A GREAT NATION--AGE OF MAJORITY. IT WAS MORE EXTRAORDINARILY AS EVERY MAN CARRIED WITH HIM, IN HIS OWN EXPERIENCE, A SCALE FOR MEASURING THE DEFICIENCIES OF YOUNG POLITICIANS. SINCE HE WOULD, IF INTERROGATED, BE OBLIGED TO DECLARE THAT HIS POLITICAL OPINION AT THE AGE OF 21 WERE TOO CRUDE AND ERRONEOUS TO MERIT AN INFLUENCE ON PUBLIC MEASURES. IT HAD BEEN SAID THAT CONGRESS HAD PROVED A GOOD SCHOOL FOR OUR YOUNG MEN. I'VE HEARD THAT COMMENT. IT MIGHT BE SO FAR ANYTHING HE KNEW, BUT IF IT WERE, HE CHOOSE THAT THEY SHOULD BEAR THE EXPENSE OF THEIR OWN

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

EDUCATION. GO TO COLLEGE. GET SOME LIFE EXPERIENCE. GET SOME WISDOM. MAKE A MISTAKE OR TWO. FIND OUT, AS SENATOR CHAMBERS SAYS, YOU'RE NOT IMMORTAL. THAT'S WHY FOR SOLDIERS, THEY WANT 18-YEAR-OLDS FOR SOLDIERS, YOU KNOW. THEY DON'T REALIZE THAT YOU CAN DIE, THAT YOU'RE MORTAL. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR GROENE: WHY DID I VOTE FOR THIS? BECAUSE I MADE A COMMITMENT TO SENATOR LARSON. I'M 60 YEARS OLD. MY FIRST YEAR HERE, I MADE A COUPLE MISTAKES. I WONDER WHAT I WOULD HAVE DONE AT 18. IF SENATOR LARSON CAN INFLUENCE ME WITH HIS SMILE, WHAT DO YOU THINK AN 18-YEAR-OLD IS GOING TO BE LIKE IN THIS BODY? ANYWAY, I VOTED FOR IT AND I'M GOING TO KEEP MY WORD. THAT'S SOMETHING YOU LEARN WITH AGE, TOO, IF YOU GAIN CHARACTER. BUT IT IS NOT A GOOD IDEA. THIS IS NOT NECESSARY. NOBODY 18 YEARS OLD IS ASKING FOR IT. AND THANK YOU FOR LISTENING. I AM DONE. [LR26CA]

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

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. COLLEAGUES, I THINK THAT LAST VOTE PRETTY WELL INDICATES THAT 33 VOTES AREN'T THERE TO DO THIS. I SAID I COULDN'T SUPPORT THIS, BUT I WOULD SUPPORT THE IDEA IF IT WERE STRICTLY FOR THIS LEGISLATIVE BODY. THAT STILL STANDS. I WOULD MAKE A SUGGESTION TO SENATOR LARSON, AND HE CAN DO WITH IT AS HE PLEASES, THAT HE AMEND THIS BILL, BRING IT DOWN TO JUST COVER THIS LEGISLATIVE BODY. IT WOULD HAVE A FAIR CHANCE OF PASSING. WE GET THAT OUT TO A VOTE OF THE PEOPLE AND SEE. FOLLOW IT UP NEXT YEAR IF HE WANTS WITH THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE, WHICH I DON'T BELIEVE HAS A PROVERBIAL SNOWBALL'S CHANCE OF GETTING OUT OF HERE, BUT HE COULD COME OUT OF THIS WITH SOMETHING INTACT THAT HE WOULD LIKE TO GET TO A VOTE OF THE PEOPLE. SENATOR LARSON CERTAINLY IS NOT OBLIGATED TO TAKE ADVICE FROM ME, BUT THERE IS A PATH FORWARD ON THIS BILL. OTHERWISE, WE'LL SPEND ANOTHER ROUGHLY HOUR AND A HALF ON IT AND IT WILL DIE A DIGNIFIED DEATH AND NOTHING WILL HAVE BEEN ACCOMPLISHED. HAVING SAID MY PIECE ON THAT, SEEING SENATOR SCHUMACHER IS NOT HERE ANYMORE BECAUSE HE'S BEEN...AH, HE IS HERE. HE'S BEEN SITTING BACK

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

THERE TOO QUIET AND TOO COMFORTABLE FOR TOO LONG. I YIELD THE REMAINDER OF MY TIME TO SENATOR SCHUMACHER. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR SCHUMACHER, 3:20 YOU'RE YIELDED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: THANK YOU, MR. SPEAKER. THANK YOU, SENATOR BLOOMFIELD. YOU KNOW, SENATOR CHAMBERS AND I WERE JUST HAVING A DISCUSSION OVER WHAT IS THE CORRECT WORD. IS IT PREVENTIVE OR PREVENTATIVE? AND I REMEMBER, WE WERE DEBATING IN COLLEGE, I SAID PREVENTATIVE AND I GOT BOXED UPSIDE THE EARS BECAUSE I WAS TOLD IT'S PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, NOT PREVENTATIVE MEDICINE, UNLESS THE GUY IS A STUTTERER, IN WHICH CASE IT'S PREVENTATIVE MEDICINE. SENATOR CHAMBERS, WILL YOU YIELD TO A QUESTION? [LR26CA]

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

SENATOR CHAMBERS: YES, I WILL. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: SENATOR CHAMBERS, WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PREVENTIVE AND PREVENTATIVE? [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: PROBABLY AN A. (LAUGHTER) [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: IS THAT ALL? [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THAT'S ENOUGH TO ANSWER THE QUESTION THE WAY IT WAS PHRASED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: THANK YOU, SENATOR CHAMBERS. A PREVENTATIVE MEDICINE. AT ANY RATE, SENATOR BLOOMFIELD GAVE ME SOME TIME. I WASN'T PLANNING ON SPEAKING ON THIS. I VOTED FOR THE MOTION TO BRACKET BECAUSE WE ARE RUNNING OUT OF TIME AND HAVE ONE WHOLE LOT OF IMPORTANT ISSUES TO COME BEFORE US. AND CLEARLY, THERE IS NOT THE KIND OF FOCUS AND EFFORT ON LANGUAGE AND LEGAL PRECISION THAT HAS BEEN PUT INTO LR26CA TO MOVE IT OUT WITH OUR IMPRIMATUR TO THE VOTERS. IT'S DEFECTIVE. IT HAS, AT THE MINIMUM NOW, TWO SUBJECTS, MAYBE FOUR SUBJECTS. AND THERE'S NO EFFORT TO CORRECT THAT. THERE'S AN EFFORT THAT CORRECTS THE ONE OF LAST WEEK, WHICH HAD FIVE SUBJECTS

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

OR SO. THIS ONE ISN'T READY TO GO AND I THINK THAT THE WISE THING FOR THE BODY TO DO IS WOULD BE TO RECONSIDER THIS, TO BRACKET IT, TO LET IT BE BROUGHT BACK AGAIN NEXT YEAR AFTER SOMEBODY WITH PROPER... [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: ...CONSTITUTIONAL LEGAL BACKGROUND HAS REVIEWED IT, HAS WRITTEN IT, HAS MADE SENSE OF IT, AND THEN DECIDE WHETHER IT CAN BE PRESENTED TO THE VOTERS IN A SINGLE MEASURE OR IS NEEDED TO BE PRESENTED TO THE VOTERS IN MULTIPLE MEASURES, AS I THINK THE COURT HAS HINTED TO US. WE NEED TO MOVE ON. WE KNOW WE HAVE ANOTHER FILIBUSTER AFTER THIS OVER A GAMBLING BILL THAT HAS MORE ISSUES THAN SAILORS IN IT. AND SO WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO WORK THROUGH THAT ONE, OR NOT, AND THEN ALL THE OTHER BILLS WITH TAXES AND MEDICAID AND WHO KNOWS WHAT ELSE. I THINK THAT THE RECONSIDER MOTION IS GOOD. THANK YOU. [LR26CA]

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

SENATOR McCOLLISTER: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. GOOD MORNING, COLLEAGUES. I WOULD AGREE THAT WE NEED TO VOTE GREEN ON THE RECONSIDER MOTION BY SENATOR CHAMBERS. WE ARE RUNNING OUT OF TIME. AND AS A SENATOR WITH FOUR OR FIVE IMPORTANT BILLS TO COME BEFORE THIS BODY, WE NEED TO MOVE ON. SO WITH THAT, I WOULD CALL ON SENATOR LARSON TO PULL THIS BILL AND RELIEF US OF THE NECESSITY TO GO ANOTHER HOUR AND A HALF ON A BILL THAT'S NOT GOING TO GO ANYWHERE. WITH 17 VOTES TO AFFIRM SENATOR CHAMBERS' MOTION TO BRACKET, HE'S NOT GOING TO GET ENOUGH VOTES TO BEAT A FILIBUSTER. SO IT IS REALLY TIME TO MOVE ON AND I WOULD CALL ON SENATOR LARSON TO PULL THIS BILL. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR McCOLLISTER. SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU. MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE, AS WE LIVE IN THE MOMENT, WE MAY LOOK TO PREVIOUS MOMENTS AND TALK ABOUT HOW BAD IT WAS THEN OR HOW MUCH BETTER IT

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

WAS THEN THAN IT IS NOW. BUT THERE WAS A TIME DURING MY LIFETIME, WHICH IS LONGER THAN THAT OF ANYBODY IN HERE RIGHT NOW, WHEN, BROADLY SPEAKING, THERE WAS MORE SANITY IN THE COUNTRY AS A WHOLE. THERE WAS CERTAINLY MORE DELIBERATIVENESS IN THE LEGISLATURE. BUT I'M REALIZING THAT FROM A POSITION REMOVED FROM THOSE DAYS WHEN I WAS HERE AND THERE WAS GREATER SANITY THEN BECAUSE I HAD NOTHING TO JUDGE IT BY. I CAN NOW LOOK AT WHAT'S GOING ON RIGHT TODAY AND COMPARE IT TO WHAT WENT ON IN OTHER DAYS. THAT THING LIKE PUT HUNTING, TRAPPING, FISHING IN THE CONSTITUTION WOULD HAVE BEEN LAUGHED AT AND MOCKED JUST LIKE IT WAS WHEN SOME FOOLS FROM PENNSYLVANIA WANTED TO PUT IT INTO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. YES, THEY HAD A FISHING, TRAPPING, AND HUNTING AMENDMENT THAT THEY WANTED TO PUT IN THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND IT WAS MOCKED AND RIDICULED TO SCORN. ONE GUY SAID, WELL, HERE'S WHAT I THINK WE OUGHT TO PUT INTO THE CONSTITUTION ALSO: TO PROTECT PEOPLE'S PREROGATIVES THAT IF ON A COLD NIGHT YOU'RE SLEEPING ON THE LEFT SIDE IN YOUR BED AND CONSEQUENTLY THE RIGHT SIDE, WHICH IS EXPOSED, IS COLDER, YOU OUGHT TO HAVE THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO REVERSE YOUR POSITION AND NOW LIE ON THE RIGHT SIDE. AND THEY DID OTHER SUCH THINGS UNTIL THEY HOOTED THAT NOTION RIGHT OUT OF CONSIDERATION. BUT IT NOW IS IN THE NEBRASKA CONSTITUTION BECAUSE I WAS NOT HERE. EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLDS VOTING IS IN THE CONSTITUTION BECAUSE I AND SENATOR HALL DID THE WORK TO GET IT THERE. FOOLISHLY, OUR SALARY WAS PUT INTO THE CONSTITUTION, BUT I WAS THE ONE WHO BROUGHT THE BILL AND FOUGHT FOR IT, OVERRODE A GOVERNOR'S VETO, AND THEN FORCED THE STATE'S HAND SO THEY FILED A LAWSUIT, BECAUSE IF THEY HADN'T I WOULD HAVE. AND AS A RESULT, WE NOW GET EXPENSES, NOT BECAUSE OF THE PEOPLE WHO BRING THE KIND OF TRASH LEGISLATION WE'RE TALKING ABOUT NOW, BUT SOMEBODY WHO ANALYZED THE CONSTITUTION, THE CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH PEOPLE SERVE, AND FELT THAT THERE WERE PEOPLE INDEED WHO COULD NOT COME HERE BECAUSE THEY COULD NOT AFFORD THE EXPENSE OF BEING HERE. AND FOR SOME OF YOU, THAT EXPENSE CHECK IS MORE THAN YOUR SALARY. IT WASN'T DONE BY PEOPLE WHO ARE HERE NOW. IT WAS DONE BY A MAN OF A COMPLEXION THAT GENERALLY IS DESPISED IN THIS STATE AND THERE ARE OTHER THINGS I COULD MENTION TOO. AND MAYBE I'LL START COLLECTING THOSE ARTICLES THAT PHONE COMPANIES WERE DOING IN TERMS OF BLOCKING PEOPLE'S TELEPHONE LONG DISTANCE CALLS WITHOUT NOTIFYING THEM. I TOOK THAT ON. AND THEY FOUND OUT THERE WERE ABOUT 1,400 OR EITHER 14,000 PEOPLE WHOSE PHONE CALLS WERE BEING BLOCKED WITHOUT THEM HAVING ANY NOTICE OF IT. AND SPRINT WAS THE COMPANY THAT DID IT. AND THEY SENT THEIR NATIONAL

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

OFFICERS HERE TO ARGUE BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION AGAINST ME, NOT A LAWYER, NOT THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, BUT ME, THE BLACK MAN, THE ONE WHO IS SO HATED IN THIS STATE... [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...THAT ULTIMATELY THEY CHANGED THE CONSTITUTION TO PUT HIM OUT OF THE LEGISLATURE, GUTTED THE LEGISLATURE. BUT I CAME BACK. AND I STILL THINK THAT THE CONSTITUTION SHOULD BE PROTECTED AND ITS INTEGRITY PRESERVED. YOU ALL HAVE IT EASY. YOU CAN PLAY AROUND THE EDGES AND DO THESE SILLY THINGS BECAUSE THERE'S SOMEBODY ELSE WHO'S GOING TO TRY TO SEE THAT IT'S DONE RIGHT. AND I'M NOT THE ONLY ONE, BUT I'M THE ONE SPEAKING AND I'M SPEAKING FOR MYSELF AND WHAT I BELIEVE. AND IT'S WHY I'LL TAKE AS MUCH TIME AS IS NECESSARY TO DO THE JOB I THINK OUGHT TO BE DONE. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

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

SENATOR HANSEN: THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, AND THANK YOU, COLLEAGUES. I RISE AGAIN IN SUPPORT OF LR26CA, SENATOR MORFELD'S AMENDMENT, AND I GUESS IN OPPOSITION TO BOTH THE BRACKET AND RECONSIDERATION MOTION. YOU KNOW, I HAD HOPED THAT THAT BRACKET MOTION WOULD HAVE GIVEN US SOME CLARITY, BUT BASED ON MY COUNT, IT WAS VERY UNCLEAR. THAT'S IN FACT WHY I'D CALLED THE QUESTION ON THE BRACKET MOTION, BECAUSE I HAD ASSUMED PEOPLE HAD MADE UP THEIR MIND AND KNEW WHAT THEY WANTED. AND WE'RE GOING TO DEBATE ALL DAY OR PROBABLY A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF TOMORROW ON THE OUTCOME OF THIS EXTENDED DEBATE, BUT THERE WERE A SIGNIFICANT GROUP OF FOLKS NOT VOTING. SO HOPEFULLY THEY ARE NOT VOTING BECAUSE THEY TRULY ARE STILL WEIGHING THE PROS AND CONS OF THIS BILL AS OPPOSED TO GOING TO SWOOP IN AT THE LAST SECOND AND NOT STAND FOR CLOTURE WHEN THEY COULD HAVE SAVED US ALL SOME TIME WITH SENATOR CHAMBERS' BRACKET MOTION. YOU KNOW, HAD THE BRACKET MOTION BEEN SUCCESSFUL, I WOULD HAVE BEEN DISAPPOINTED AND I WOULD HAVE UNDERSTOOD, BUT I WOULD HAVE UNDERSTOOD. I UNDERSTAND THAT THERE'S...REASONABLE PEOPLE CAN DISAGREE. YOU KNOW, IT'S BEEN INTERESTING SERVING IN THIS BODY, THE AGE, WHENEVER AGE COMES UP. YOU KNOW, WE TALK ABOUT THE AGE OF MAJORITY

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

IN NEBRASKA BEING 19, WHICH I UNDERSTAND IS NOT IN LINE WITH MANY STATES, BUT I CAN JUST RECALL OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD TWO OR THREE TIMES WHERE THERE'S BEEN SOME REFERENCE TO AGE IN A STATUTE OR BILL, AND WE WANT TO...AND AN AMENDMENT IS FILED TO MOVE IT TO 21 RATHER THAN THE AGE MAJORITY OF 19, RATHER THAN ANY OTHER SORT OF AGES. SO I UNDERSTAND WE CAN HAVE POLICY DISAGREEMENTS AND DISCUSSION AS TO WHEN WE WANT EACH AGE TO APPLY TO EACH SITUATION, WHICH IS PART OF THE REASON I CLICKED ON MY LIGHT BECAUSE IT'S BEEN ON AND ON TODAY, VARIOUS THINGS. VARIOUS PEOPLE HAVE REFERENCED DIFFERENT STATUTES THAT IMPACTS SPECIFICALLY THIS GROUP OF LIKE 18- TO 19-YEAR-OLDS OR 18- TO 21-YEAR-OLDS OR SIMILAR GROUPS. WE CAN GO THROUGH AND HAVE A DISCUSSION CASE BY CASE ON, YOU KNOW, REPRESENTATION IN THE COURT SYSTEM. WE CAN TALK ABOUT STUDENT LOANS. WE COULD TALK ABOUT OUR STATE'S ALCOHOL LAWS ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS AND HOW WE IMPACT THIS GROUP OF PEOPLE. THAT'S ALL REASONABLE DISCUSSION, THAT'S ALL RELEVANT, THAT'S DEFINITELY WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THIS BODY. AND IF SOMEONE WANTS TO BRING BILLS CHANGING THOSE THINGS, I THINK THAT DESERVES FAIR AND FULL DEBATE. BUT JUST TO SAY THAT WE TREAT THIS GROUP OF YOUNG PEOPLE, 18- TO 20-YEAR-OLDS, A SPECIAL WAY, SAY, IN THE COURT SYSTEM OR THROUGH EDUCATION, THEREFORE, WE CAN'T TREAT THEM THE SAME AS WE DO A PERSON ABOVE 21 IN THE POLITICAL PROCESS, I DON'T NECESSARILY THINK THERE'S A STRONG CONNECTION. IF YOU THINK 21 IS A REASONABLE, ARBITRARY LINE TO GAUGE THE APPROXIMATE MATURITY AND AGE EXPERIENCE FOR RUNNING FOR POLITICAL OFFICE IN THE STATE OF NEBRASKA, I DISAGREE BUT I UNDERSTAND. I UNDERSTAND. I THINK THAT'S A FAIR POSITION. BUT WHEN WE START TRYING TO TIE IN OTHER BILLS AND THINGS, SAY SUPPORTERS OF THIS PROPOSAL SUPPORTED IN PREVIOUS YEARS, I THINK WE START GETTING INTO MESSY AND STRANGE AREAS WHERE IT'S NOT...WHERE A VOTE FOR OR AGAINST THIS BILL DOES NOT NECESSARILY MEAN YOU SHOULD VOTE FOR OR AGAINST A SEPARATE ONE. WITH THAT, I'M JUST GOING TO SUMMARIZE MY EARLIER NOTION THAT I THINK THE RIGHTS TO POLITICAL PARTICIPATION IN THE STATE OF NEBRASKA SHOULD BE CONSISTENT. I THINK IF YOU'RE ABLE TO VOTE FOR A CAMPAIGN AND MAYBE CAST THE DECIDING VOTE FOR A CAMPAIGN, I THINK IF YOU'RE... YOU SHOULD BE ABLE TO ALSO PUT YOUR NAME... [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SENATOR HANSEN: ...IN THAT CAMPAIGN. SO THAT'S WHERE I AM ON THIS BILL. I HOPE THAT WE STILL HAVE CONTINUED AND LIVELY DEBATE. AND THAT'S ALL. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR HANSEN. SENATOR CHAMBERS, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. THERE'S NO ONE ELSE IN THE QUEUE. YOU CAN USE THIS FOR YOUR CLOSING OR YOU MAY NOT. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: NO, NO, NO, I'M ENJOYING IT. MEMBERS OF LEGISLATURE, I'VE BEEN HERE ALL MORNING. TRUE ENOUGH, IT'S NOT A LONG TIME, BUT IT'S LONGER THAN SOME OF THE DAYS, FOR EXAMPLE, IF WE HAD STARTED AT 10:00. I'M NOT GOING TO WEAR OUT. I'M NOT GOING TO RUN DOWN. YOU ALL HAVE SEEN THAT ENERGIZER BUNNY WHO GOES AND GOES AND GOES WHEN EVERYBODY ELSE STOPS. WELL, I WAS TAKING THE STEPS THREE AT A TIME THE OTHER DAY, SENATOR BLOOMFIELD, AND GUESS WHAT I SAW IN THE CORNER OF ONE OF THE STEPS? THE LITTLE ENERGIZER BUNNY SITTING THERE RESTING. WHEN I CAN OUTDO THE ENERGIZER BUNNY, THEN YOU KNOW THAT I'M NOT GOING TO GIVE UP ON SOMETHING THAT I BELIEVE IN. I DO BELIEVE THAT THE CONSTITUTION IS THE BEDROCK OF THE LEGAL SYSTEM IN THIS STATE. THE LESS CLUTTER IN IT, THE BETTER. THE LESS...THE FEWER ILL-THOUGHT-OUT THINGS DUMPED INTO IT, THE BETTER. THIS IS NOT A WISE MOVE TO MAKE. I'M NOT EVEN GOING TO ALL THE WAY TO THE POINT OF WHETHER OR NOT YOUNG PEOPLE OUGHT TO VOTE AT THAT AGE. IT'S AN UNWISE MOVE FOR THE LEGISLATURE TO MAKE. THERE ARE NOT YOUNG PEOPLE THAT SENATOR LARSON HAD RALLIED TO COME HERE AND SIT UP IN THE BALCONIES AND WATCH. WHEN WE WERE TALKING ABOUT THE DEATH PENALTY, A LOT OF PEOPLE WERE HERE. WHEN SENATOR BLOOMFIELD BRINGS HIS MOTORCYCLE HELMET BILL, PEOPLE ARE HERE WHO HAVE AN INTEREST IN IT. AND NOW SENATOR LARSON IS TELLING US--AND SENATOR HANSEN AND SENATOR MORFELD AND THE REST OF THE DELUDED PEOPLE--ARE TELLING US HOW THIS IS SUCH AN IMPORTANT ISSUE, AND THERE ARE NO YOUNG PEOPLE HERE, NONE SHOWED UP AT THE HEARING. AND THEY COULD TAKE IT AS A CIVICS PROJECT TO GET SIGNATURES AND PUT IT ON THE BALLOT, AND DEMONSTRATE HOW MUCH THEY WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THE POLITICAL PROCESS. THEY DON'T NEED THE LEGISLATURE TO DO THIS. THEY DIDN'T ASK THE LEGISLATURE TO DO THIS. SENATOR LARSON BROUGHT IT UP AND HE AND HIS STAFF MEMBER, NEITHER OF WHOM KNEW ENOUGH TO WRITE IT PROPERLY, PUT IT TOGETHER. AND SENATOR HANSEN VOTED FOR WHAT THEY WERE DOING. HE WAS SATISFIED, AS MESSED UP AS IT WAS, BECAUSE HE DOESN'T VIEW THE CONSTITUTION THE SAME WAY I DO. I'M NOT GOING TO SAY HE DOESN'T CARE.

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

I'M GOING TO SAY HE APPARENTLY HAD CONFIDENCE THAT SOMETHING LIKE THIS WAS PROPERLY DRAWN, PROPERLY FRAMED, AND WAS READY TO BE PRESENTED TO THE PUBLIC AS THE BEST PRODUCT THAT THIS LEGISLATURE COLLECTIVELY COULD PRESENT. THERE'S NO WAY MY VOTE WOULD BE ON SOMETHING LIKE THIS. AND THE ONLY THING THAT HAS BEEN HAPPENING IS THAT THOSE WHO SUPPORT IT ARE OFFERING AMENDMENTS, THEN AN AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT, BECAUSE THEY GOT IT WRONG, SENATOR HANSEN. AND WHEN THEY THOUGHT THEY HAD IT RIGHT, IT WAS WRONGER, WRONGER, MORE WRONG, LESS RIGHT. AND NOW THERE'S AN AMENDMENT TO THAT AMENDMENT. HOW ABOUT THAT? AND YOU WERE GOING TO VOTE FOR IT. I STARTED TO SAY I WISH I HAD PEOPLE BLINDLY FOLLOWING ME LIKE THAT, BUT I DON'T THINK I WANT THAT. I OFTEN TELL PEOPLE WHEN THEY ASK ME WHAT I PROPOSE TO DO ON A THING I SAY I'LL QUOTE STONEWALL JACKSON: IF THE SLEEVES OF MY COAT KNEW MY PLANS, I SHOULD HAVE TO BURN MY COAT. DO YOU KNOW HOW STONEWALL JACKSON DIED? THEY WERE HAVING MANEUVERS AND THERE WAS NOT COMMUNICATION BETWEEN STONEWALL... [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: ONE MINUTE. [LR26CA]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...AND SOME OF HIS TROOPS, AND HE WAS SHOT AND INJURED SEVERELY BY FRIENDLY FIRE. NOT ONLY DID HE NOT TELL THE SLEEVES OF HIS COAT, HE DIDN'T TELL ALL OF HIS TROOPS. AND ONE OF HIS OWN SHOT HIM. AND HE DEVELOPED COMPLICATIONS AND DIED. SO SOMETIMES SOMETHING THAT HAS ALLURE WHEN WE SAY IT, IN PRACTICE THERE MAY HAVE TO BE MODIFICATIONS TO IT. I, THOUGH, HAVE TOLD YOU WHAT I INTEND TO DO. AND PEOPLE CALL IT A THREAT WHEN I SAY I'LL TAKE AS MUCH TIME AS I NEED TO KILL IT. WELL, IS IT A THREAT WHEN THEY SAY I'LL TAKE AS MUCH TIME AS IT TAKES TO GET IT? IT'S NOT A THREAT WHEN THEY SAY WHAT THEY SAY, BUT IT'S A THREAT WHEN I SAY WHAT I SAY. THAT'S WHY I'M NOT DETERRED AT ALL IN TERMS OF WHAT I'M GOING TO DO. THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT. [LR26CA]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THANK YOU, SENATOR CHAMBERS. MR. CLERK, WE WILL GO NOW TO THE AGENDA AT 11:55. [LR26CA]

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, THE FIRST BILL, LB295. SENATOR HANSEN, I HAVE ENROLLMENT AND REVIEW AMENDMENTS. (ER158, LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGE 501.) [LB295]

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

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR HANSEN, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LB295]

SENATOR HANSEN: MR. PRESIDENT, I MOVE WE ADOPT THE E&R AMENDMENTS TO LB295. [LB295]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THE QUESTION IS THE ADOPTION OF THE E&R AMENDMENTS. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE. OPPOSED, NAY. PASSES. [LB295]

CLERK: I HAVE NOTHING FURTHER ON THE BILL, MR. PRESIDENT. [LB295]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR HANSEN FOR A MOTION. [LB295]

SENATOR HANSEN: MR. PRESIDENT, I MOVE WE ADVANCE LB295 TO E&R FOR ENGROSSING. [LB295]

SPEAKER HADLEY: YOU'VE HEARD THE MOTION. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE. OPPOSED? MOTION PASSES. MR. CLERK. [LB295]

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, LB53. SENATOR KINTNER HAD AN AMENDMENT TO THE BILL, BUT HE WISHES TO WITHDRAW. [LB53]

SPEAKER HADLEY: THAT IS WITHDRAWN. [LB53]

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, SENATOR HANSEN, THERE ARE E&R AMENDMENTS. (ER159, LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGE 504.) [LB53]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR HANSEN, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LB53]

SENATOR HANSEN: MR. PRESIDENT, I MOVE WE ADOPT THE E&R AMENDMENTS TO LB53. [LB53]

SPEAKER HADLEY: YOU'VE HEARD THE MOTION. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE. OPPOSED, NAY. MOTION PASSES. [LB53]

CLERK: NOTHING FURTHER ON THE BILL, SENATOR. [LB53]

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

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR HANSEN FOR A MOTION. [LB53]

SENATOR HANSEN: MR. PRESIDENT, I MOVE WE ADVANCE LB53 TO E&R FOR ENGROSSING. [LB53]

SPEAKER HADLEY: YOU'VE HEARD THE MOTION. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE. OPPOSED, NAY. PASSES. MR. CLERK. [LB53]

CLERK: LB311. SENATOR, THERE ARE E&R AMENDMENTS. (ER161, LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGE 509.) [LB311]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR HANSEN, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LB311]

SENATOR HANSEN: MR. PRESIDENT, I MOVE WE ADOPT THE AMENDMENTS TO LB311. [LB311]

SPEAKER HADLEY: YOU'VE HEARD THE MOTION. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE. OPPOSED, NAY. MOTION PASSES. [LB311]

CLERK: I HAVE NOTHING FURTHER ON THE BILL, SENATOR. [LB311]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR HANSEN. [LB311]

SENATOR HANSEN: MR. PRESIDENT, I MOVE WE ADVANCE LB311 TO E&R FOR ENGROSSING. [LB311]

SPEAKER HADLEY: ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE. OPPOSED, NAY. MOTION PASSES. MR. CLERK. [LB311]

CLERK: LB400. SENATOR, I HAVE NO AMENDMENTS TO THE BILL. [LB400]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR HANSEN FOR A MOTION. [LB400]

SENATOR HANSEN: MR. PRESIDENT, I MOVE WE ADVANCE LB400 TO E&R FOR ENGROSSING. [LB400]

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

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SPEAKER HADLEY: YOU'VE HEARD THE MOTION. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE. OPPOSED, NAY. MOTION PASSES. MR. CLERK. [LB400]

CLERK: LB400A. SENATOR, THERE ARE E&R AMENDMENTS PENDING. (ER160, LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGE 509.) [LB400A]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR HANSEN FOR A MOTION. [LB400A]

SENATOR HANSEN: MR. PRESIDENT, I MOVE WE ADOPT THE E&R AMENDMENTS TO LB400A. [LB400A]

SPEAKER HADLEY: YOU'VE HEARD THE MOTION. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE. OPPOSED, NAY. MOTION PASSES. MR. CLERK. [LB400A]

CLERK: NOTHING FURTHER ON THE BILL, SENATOR. [LB400A]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR HANSEN, YOU'RE RECOGNIZED. [LB400A]

SENATOR HANSEN: MR. PRESIDENT, I MOVE WE ADVANCE LB400A TO E&R FOR ENGROSSING. [LB400A]

SPEAKER HADLEY: YOU'VE HEARD THE MOTION. ALL IF IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE. OPPOSED SAY NAY. MOTION PASSES. MR. CLERK. [LB400A]

CLERK: LB378. SENATOR, I HAVE NO AMENDMENTS TO THE BILL. [LB378]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR HANSEN FOR A MOTION. [LB378]

SENATOR HANSEN: MR. PRESIDENT, I MOVE WE ADVANCE LB378 TO E&R FOR ENGROSSING. [LB378]

SPEAKER HADLEY: YOU'VE HEARD THE MOTION. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE. OPPOSED, NAY. MOTION PASSES. MR. CLERK. [LB378]

CLERK: LB328. I HAVE NO AMENDMENTS TO THE BILL. [LB328]

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

Floor Debate
February 17, 2016

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR HANSEN FOR A MOTION. [LB328]

SENATOR HANSEN: MR. PRESIDENT I MOVE WE ADVANCE LB328 TO E&R FOR ENGROSSING. [LB328]

SPEAKER HADLEY: YOU'VE HEARD THE MOTION. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE. ALL OPPOSED, NAY. MOTION PASSES. MR. CLERK. [LB328]

CLERK: SENATOR, LB19. I HAVE NO AMENDMENTS TO THE BILL. [LB19]

SPEAKER HADLEY: SENATOR HANSEN FOR A MOTION. [LB19]

SENATOR HANSEN: MR. PRESIDENT, I MOVE WE ADVANCE LB19 TO E&R FOR ENGROSSING. [LB19]

SPEAKER HADLEY: YOU'VE HEARD THE MOTION. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE. OPPOSED, NAY. MOTION PASSES. MR. CLERK. [LB19]

CLERK: MR. PRESIDENT, I HAVE ITEMS. A HEARING NOTICE FROM THE HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE. YOUR COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, CHAIRED BY SENATOR CAMPBELL, REPORTS LB818 AND LB962, LB963 TO GENERAL FILE, LB567 TO GENERAL FILE WITH AMENDMENTS, LB684 TO GENERAL FILE WITH AMENDMENTS, LIKEWISE WITH LB721, LB1033. ENROLLMENT AND REVIEW REPORTS THE FOLLOWING BILLS TO SELECT FILE: LB700, LB703, LB729, LB758, AND LB840. I HAVE AN AMENDMENT TO BE PRINTED TO LR26CA FROM SENATOR MORFELD. NAME ADDS: SENATOR JOHNSON TO LR35. (LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL PAGES 598-602.) [LB818 LB962 LB963 LB567 LB684 LB721 LB1033 LB700 LB703 LB729 LB758 LB840 LR26CA LR35]

MR. PRESIDENT, SENATOR McCOLLISTER WOULD MOVE TO ADJOURN THE BODY UNTIL THURSDAY MORNING, FEBRUARY 18, AT 9:00 A.M.

SPEAKER HADLEY: YOU'VE HEARD THE MOTION TO ADJOURN. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE. OPPOSED, NAY. WE ARE ADJOURNED.