

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

February 8, 1999 LB 211

here. Obviously, the body's spoken in the general direction they have. We have regional center patients who are addicted to nicotine. I'm not sure what this means to the number of orderlies that you take out and...take them outside to have them smoke or not. We own facilities that have "residence-like" quality, cottages in which people that are doing enforcement in the reformatory or Game and Parks, areas where we've basically said live on the property but this is your home. And there are residences like that that would not be...that would be beyond the ambit of this, if it were anybody else, but, in fact, they are probably state owned. There are fraternity and sorority houses that are now leasing buildings from us. Because of the inability of us to have a public hearing to define the differences between an office building, the kind of thing where the public is, and the kinds of things that either might have some other circumstance, like an additional cost in a regional center or a health facility, or a "residence-like" kind of situation, we are acting, I think, beyond what it is that we know to be the wrong that originally brought LB 211, which I'm prepared to vote for, but we're past the place where what we know what we're doing because the implications are thought out. And that's one of the virtues of a public hearing which this kind of concept has not had. We do not know all of the implications here and we haven't had a chance to think about them. I would suggest to you that doing 11...211 as it was originally written today and doing an interim study that makes the Tyson amendment the rule of law next year, so that people who have exigencies and who have legitimate cases to make, where we might, upon reflection, say, you're right, maybe this is overbroad. have an opportunity for a day in court which they now not...do not have under the Tyson amendment. I'd like to vote for 211 as it was originally drawn. I would like to do that. But if you move to this extensive of a change without the opportunity of people to bring us examples in a public hearing that we would weigh and consider, I'd have to vote no, and that's unfortunate because I'm not adverse to the original goal of this bill.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Landis. Chair recognizes Senator Chambers on the Beutler amendment.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature,