

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 4, 2001 LB 114, 671

satellites, just as with the institutions themselves, cater to many, many people who are below the age of 21 years. On the one hand, liquor is deemed such an evil when it comes to our young people consuming any amount because with the passage of LB 114, which I did vote against, consuming any amount of liquor can lead to jail time and a fine for a young person. Now there would be an opportunity to put a satellite or have a liquor establishment come into being near one of these satellite locations where we have these young people. So I want to see some consistency by this Legislature. I want to see a principle of some kind established which will give us a guide by which to determine the conduct we are going to either criminalize or approve of by law. This amendment that Senator Beutler is offering is not what I would call a consent calendar amendment. It goes to a basic principle, and maybe I would wind up ultimately agreeing with him that you shouldn't have any rule with reference to distance, but there is not the opportunity to really discuss that issue since his amendment is being offered to another bill. But I think it needs to be thoroughly discussed. So I cannot support the amendment, and if it is attached to the bill, I will not support the bill. There just is not a chance to thoroughly discuss it and I'm not going to offer amendments to Senator Beutler's amendment just to create the chance to discuss it. But I want it to be clear as to why I'm going to vote against the amendment. Senator Beutler very well may have a point that the existing law is archaic, that changes in circumstances have nullified the effectiveness of the existing law. But then people such as Senator Vrtiska and myself, being old as we are, may see that there is a reason for it, and the very arguments Senator Beutler makes about...

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...the ready availability of liquor at existing establishments could be the very argument that would take away the need for his amendment. Some areas may should be buffered despite the fact that the buffer is not going to prevent people from going outside that area seeking what it is the buffer is designed to protect a given location from. So I'm just in a position where I cannot support the amendment at this time and I will speak one more time, which will be my last time.