

fact, Section 13, specifically, will be amended I believe by the omnibus amendment which will be forthcoming to resolve the fears that have been raised by Senator Schmit. The intent of the amendment is to clarify that the provisions of LB 516 relative to the issuance of restraining orders, that is Sections 10 to 13, including the standard of irreparable injury, are not to affect the issuance of restraining orders in a divorce action. In other words, in lay person's language which I can understand, current divorce standards are not to be altered if the amendment which will be up next, I believe, is adopted. Senator Schmit is literally correct that the problem that he has and others have will be corrected. I have also just checked with a boyhood friend of mine, now a county judge in western Nebraska. The language has been shared with him. He said it may not be perfect but it certainly is something we can live with. He does agree. I would urge you to vote no. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Schmit, would you like to close, please.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President, first of all, I had my light on. I would like to use that time, if I could, to ask some questions of several of my colleagues. Senator Barrett has referred to the fact that there was or is a problem. Senator Barrett, I want to ask you, very frankly, would you have co-authored the amendment had I not introduced the amendment to this bill?

SENATOR BARRETT: Yes, probably so, Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Okay, Senator Baack, I would like to have you explain to me, if you will, would you yield, Senator Baack? Well, that is okay. I just want to say this, Mr. President, and members. I think you have here this morning an excellent example of why my amendment should be adopted. You have several very gifted legislators, attorneys, highly qualified, who understand court procedure, who understand the entire process, who understand how the system works. They know how to use that system and use it very adeptly. They used it very adeptly, in fact, in getting the amendment on the bill. Now, if it is a matter of information, Senator Vard Johnson says in the sense of fairness the amendment should be...the Schmit amendment should be rejected. Let me just suggest that in the sense of fairness, the amendment should have been better explained