

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

March 9, 1999

LB 126

operations. Can law enforcement go back to Senator Bromm's business (inaudible) establishment, you know, this day and next day and so forth? And we really, at this time, really don't have any, you know, guidelines in place to control, you know, local operations of stings or compliance checks, I guess, rather than stings. And so that's really what I think this...this amendment here is proposing to do, is trying to...is to provide some identification of how many stings, what...how often are they occur, what places, and it's...I think it's a reasonable way to make some concession, as far as the sting operations. It puts it under the umbrella of the State Patrol. They have to follow the guidelines of State Patrol and so, in that manner, I think this is a reasonable amendment.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD PRESIDING

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Beutler on the Chambers amendment.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Lieutenant Governor Maurstad, members of the Legislature, this particular section, one Senator Chambers is striking, I think Senator Schellpeper has indicated with regard to one element of it that they would be looking at it on Select File and perhaps making a change there. I'm a little bit...that has to do with the section requiring a truthful oral response. I'm a little bit concerned about other criteria that have been set out though, with respect to what's really going on here and with respect to whether it can, in fact, be cleaned up on Select File. But here's the other...another problem, in my opinion, that I wanted to point out to you, and it has to do with the requirement of truthful identification, and let's take a hypothetical. Let's say I'm a 16-year-old young woman and I walk into a liquor store, and we'll forget about the oral responses for a minute, and they say, let's see some identification and I hand them a false identification. Now, right there I'm outside the guidelines. As a retailer, I'm protected because they have given me a false identification, and you might say, well, maybe that should be the end of the matter. But what, with regard to this young woman who's 16, what if she gives an identification that shows a picture of a bearded man who's 54? Are we saying that the retailer should be protected and should be able to go ahead in this circumstance when obviously they should identify that identification as false?