

May 2, 1995

LB 592

SPEAKER WITHEM: The amendment is not agreed to. The call is raised. Mr. Clerk, anything further?

CLERK: Nothing further at this time, Mr. President.

SPEAKER WITHEM: The motion before the body then is the advancement of LB 592 to E & R Initial. Senator Schimek. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, this is one of those bills which may have caused people to grow tired, but what we are dealing with is something very important. Although it was on his amendment, Senator Lindsay made a very significant point, in my opinion. If there are flaws in this bill, we need to work our way through them. There should be more to what we do, as legislators, than what there might be for the Governor to get a bill that he wants. If he gets the bill, it's over. If he makes it to the Senate by pointing to all of these things, so much the better for him, but what we are doing, as a Legislature, is putting a policy into place. It is going to have an impact on the lives of people in this state. Since that is the case, and since there are possibilities, numerous ones, that this bill could be inappropriately applied, we need to work our way through it and minimize the damage that can be done. I have told Senator Day that because I am having a little difficulty reading both of these pieces in our bill book, some amendments that I want to offer, I will wait until Select File. I am not doing that because the amendments are not worthy, in my opinion, but I want to be able to draft them to the appropriate provision or location in the bill. But I do want to say at this point that I'm not going to vote for 592. There is no form of 592 I would vote for as long as it contains the provision for revoking people's licenses. What is not dealt with by us on the floor while we are enacting this legislation is the situation where somebody, for a vindictive reason, could deliberately give some misinformation in this process that is being gone through to arrive at the decision to revoke somebody's license. Where is that person? How will that person be found? How can a determination be made that the act was vindictive or intentional? So making liability hinge on a deliberate act would, in my opinion, be too high a standard. But there has got to be some way to call for accountability. This whole bill is premised on the notion that the state is trying to make men and women, who have a child support obligation, accountable. Then