

March 27, 1979

LB 234

reason for passing the amendment. The first argument raised was by my good friend, Senator Kelly, and he said, well look, if you are going to do this then make the age of marriage 19. Senator Kelly, last year this Legislature passed a law making the age of marriage 19. The only exceptions to this are if somebody has parental consent, certain other things. I might also point out that with liquor somebody under 19 can drink liquor in their own home with parental consent, but in uniformity we made the age of marriage 19 last year. The other argument raised by Senator Kelly, certainly he is properly concerned, has to do with the liquor question. I assure you it is a separate question, and that the constitutional reason for the legislation being allowed in the area of liquor is a constitutional decision that started from the U. S. Supreme Court, worked its way down through other courts that said, with liquor the states have a special authority, a special police power to regulate it, so, Senator Kelly, if we wanted, if it was our judgment, we could probably make that...we could probably cut off people from using liquor at 60 or 65, make it 25 or whatever you want it. It is a distinctly separate matter as upheld by the U. S. Supreme Court. The next question raised I think was by Senator Landis, and though nobody was really listening very carefully, he spoke in some very eloquent legal arguments on the whole constitutional question. Now let's throw this out, at 19 we try you as an adult, we don't run you to the juvenile court. Do we? We treat you as an adult at 19 and 20 because you reached adulthood. Do you raise questions then, that now between 19 and 20 you should be in juvenile court? It's certainly a legitimate question. If you are not going to allow people, the peers to be there, then do you create this other situation? I think there is a legitimate and an honest constitutional question as to whether you can have this variation. The next question raised was by Senator Stoney and Senator Haberman, and this has been the one that concerns me the most, and the one that I personally have some problems with, but we have made that decision. Now what did they say? Senator Stoney said between 19 and 21 you mature. There is a maturation that occurs. That is true, but what is the whole theory, the whole philosophy of adulthood? The whole philosophy is you are moving towards maturity, and at some point...at some point, the state arbitrarily says this is the line. You are now going to be treated as an adult with responsibilities as an adult, but also obligations. Now obviously, everybody in the room knows not everybody at 19 is equally mature. There is maturity that occurs between 21 and 25, between