

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

March 9, 1999

LB 126

has to do with the fact that we need to have the State Patrol involved in setting up these stings. There seems to be some feeling that that would be a good thing to have some coordination with the State Patrol on these matters, and maybe that's the value that people see in this particular amendment. But with regard to the guidelines and the necessity of the guidelines, I think that needs to be rethought radically and, frankly, I see no reason now why there should be any guidelines specified at all. You may recall from an earlier discussion that we had that Senator Schellpeper indicated that there was a law that prohibited the giving of false identification. There is not a law, to anybody's knowledge, that prohibits that. What there is, is a section of the statute that sets up defenses in these situations, defenses for the retailers, the liquor control person, and you should listen to these carefully now because this is already law. These are defenses, existing defenses, and it lists three things and they're "and", so it has to be one, two, and three. These are the existing defenses: In any prosecution of or any proceeding against any licensee charged with having made a sale to a minor, proof of the following three things shall be an absolute defense, absolute defense. One, the purchaser falsely represented in writing and supported with other documentary proof that he or she was of legal age to purchase alcoholic liquor. So if they presented something in writing falsely, that's an absolute defense. And the appearance of such purchaser was such that the ordinary and prudent person would believe that such appearance conformed to any documentary description of appearance presented by the purchaser; and, three, the seller was acting in good faith in reliance upon the written representation, other documentary evidence, and the appearance of the purchaser, and in the belief the purchaser was of legal age to make such purchase. Why do we need any criteria at all in the State Patrol guidelines when these defenses exist here in statute? In other words, there's no point to setting out things in statute when the defenses exist. But you confuse the law and create possible additional defenses if you put something other than what is in these defenses into the guidelines. And I suggest to you that that may be what's happening here because, for example, with the conversation with respect to truthful identification, Senator Schellpeper argued, well, there's a law that says that if it's a false identification that's against the law. Well, it's a defense.