

May 22, 1985

LB 600

SPEAKER NICHOL: The motion fails. Do you have anything else, Mr. Clerk?

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Chambers would move to amend the committee amendments. (See third Chambers amendment found on page 2469 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Chambers, please.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I'm going to give them all of the time that they want. On page 2, in Section 77 as identified by that number in the committee amendment, I'm changing the date September 1, 1986 to October 1, 1986 to give them even more time. I'm trying to be as accommodating as I can. I'm trying to follow the logic that has been presented to me. If they need time, the more time they are given the better. This will still put them under the deadline. Then they can let the judges go out there and soothe hurt eagles and unruffle feathers because Senator Hoagland told us, Senator Higgins, contrary to what you were told by committee counsel, that the real problem with this bill going into effect immediately is that lawyers and judges don't agree on it. I heard him say that, and if you'll check the transcript you'll see that he said that. He said it stayed in the committee so long because judges and lawyers don't agree on it. That is what the Chairman of the committee said. Of course it won't be the first time that the boss doesn't know as much as...at any rate, if lawyers don't agree why should we be expected to agree. If the judges don't agree, which judges don't agree and what don't they agree with? What do they find obnoxious about this bill? If it is going to make possible the collection of child support, if it is going to make easier the collection of child support then why are any judges opposed to it? Why are lawyers opposed to it? Is it that some people think these people who are not lawyers, who are going to be allowed to do the things that customarily judges do, do they feel that that shouldn't be the case? They had nonlawyers serving as some kind of associate judges or something out in the rural areas, Senator Schmit. I hate to keep saying that and making it sound like it is pejorative, but that is the way it is used in the Legislature here. If you are in the rural area something is wrong, or you'd be somewhere else, just like if you weren't wicked you wouldn't be poor. That is for Senator Schmit and I, we are poor. That is the