

car. At that time, Sergeant Conihan approached and he was as nice as pie when he saw that it was me. And the whole scenario changed.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But, nevertheless, this was not a drug dealer, not a person engaged in drug activity, a woman who was being intimidated and was indeed frightened by the police.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Wesely, please.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members. I have followed this from a distance. The issue is one of great interest to everybody, obviously, concerned about drugs in our state and what's happening. But I guess in some ways it's a bit humorous. It's like with all the law enforcement personnel around our country and our state supposedly working on the drug issue, trying to enforce our laws and stop illegal drug activity, we finally send a message out, through this legislation, that we're really serious about it because now we're going to have the IRS get involved and we're going to sick the IRS on drug dealers and the Revenue Department, now we really mean business. It's kind of an interesting situation. We've been trying all along to deal with this through the law enforcement mechanisms that we've had in place, and odd that we need to take this step to maybe perhaps do what we need to do. The analogy would be something back to the Al Capone days, where Al Capone was able to murder and rob and wreak havoc on the City of Chicago, but it was on tax evasion that he was caught and prosecuted and sent to jail. While these individuals are able to deal in illegal drugs and do other types of illegal activity, it will be tax evasion, perhaps, on which we can most secure convictions. Pretty bizarre twist of fate, but, evidently, that is what people feel we need to do, interesting and odd.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President, members. I rise to oppose Senator Conway's amendment to the bill. I apologize for being tardy. But the proposal, as it was introduced to the Revenue Committee last year, was one that, as others have mentioned, has been before the body on a number of different occasions, at least before the Revenue Committee I think on a number of different occasions. But the...LB 260 as it was