

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

March 9, 1999

LB 126

for just 90 days, and I think most of them would probably go that route on the first offense. But if you have a teenager that continually drinks, I think we need to get it stopped before they get older because it's only going to get worse. When they get to be adults, you are going to have the same problem. They are going to be caught with DWI. We're attempting to save lives with this bill, and I think it will do that. It won't save every life, but it will save some lives. Getting back to the Chambers amendment, again, if he...and that's what he wants to do, it, in our opinion, it opens up the law and allows more minors to be charged, but if that is what the body wants to do, that's what we'll do. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator. For discussion on the Chambers amendment to the committee amendments to LB 126, Senator Robak.

SENATOR ROBAK: Thank you, Madam...thank you, Mr. President. Sorry about that. I am just continuing where my light went off, because I have to know if this memo that...to the...from Ken Winston, Legal Counsel, number three, I don't know if everybody has that or not, or just the members of the committee. It says the term "possession" is defined as being in physical contact with or having physical control over alcoholic liquor. What does "physical contact with or having physical control over alcoholic liquor" mean?

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Schellpeper.

SENATOR ROBAK: What does "physical control over alcoholic liquor" mean? The term "possession", I would assume that minor in possession, is defined as having physical contact with or having physical control over alcoholic liquor. Does that mean just having it in your...having an unopened bottle in your car or at your house or whatever that...? I don't understand the meaning of that.

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: Senator, the...we attempted to define it, but the first Chambers amendment struck that.

SENATOR ROBAK: No, the first Chambers amendment struck: there would be a rebuttable presumption that having a container...