

fine or both. For a second or any subsequent offense the fine is five hundred dollars and a minimum of forty-eight hours in jail, those are minimums. The thing that troubles me is again we are talking about the problem of young people obtaining alcohol. So, they are being handled, I feel in a way, that is very harsh under a statute which is very vague. I think it is not wise public policy and again it is a part of the scatter-gun approach to a very serious and complex problem. You might wind up putting some young people in jail, but I don't think that will have touched the problem to any extent or degree at all. In summing up, let me say briefly again what my objections are. Any person who would alter any piece of paper which somebody may try to use to establish their age for the purpose of obtaining liquor, if they are minors, has run a foul with this law. Only those persons under age 20 could be the recipients of this false identification before the law would be broken. The only time this false identification would be against the law was if it is to be used for the purpose of obtaining alcoholic beverages. I think it is far too vague, I'm against the mandatory sentence, and remember, the purpose is what is being punished here, not the actual delivery, not the actual sale, not the actual use. If somebody alters any kind of piece of paper or card with the purpose established in this bill, even though it never leaves that person's possession, the offense has been committed and the mandatory penalties must be imposed. Again I think it is one of those unenforceable bills. It ought not be put on the books because it could be used with a vengeance to harass if that should be a prosecutors desire. I think the bill ought to be indefinitely postponed. The reason I held up making the motion on General File, as I said, I misread the bill. I thought it was dealing with firms or companies or organizations that might do this kind of thing. But it is much broader than that and it is much too vague in its terms even if it was dealing with an organized effort.

PRESIDENT: Chair recognizes Senator Stoney.

SENATOR STONEY: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, Senator Chambers this year seems to be my nemesis. Every bill that I have had he has appropriately attempted to kill. Let me explain what LB 869 is and let me preface my remarks by saying that Senator Chambers is very astute in taking any proposition and very carefully, as an attorney, picking that proposition apart. That is what he has done in explaining his reasons for wishing to kill this proposal. I compliment him for that. But ladies and gentlemen, what this