

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

March 12, 1999 LB 126

down to his knee because that belt won't go around his belly and the part it will go around is too small to hold it up. So you got saggy britches, you got a saggy side arm, you got a sheriff who's chewing his cud, and somebody say the bank is being robbed. He say, well, we'll get around to that next week sometime, if we can, and then spits again; the old stereotype that you see in a lot of these western movies. So what we're being presented with here, Senator Smith and Senator Quandahl and young Senator Bourne, his first name is Pat. I have been calling him John for I don't know how long, but he...he gently corrected me, and I appreciate his gentleness. He's a gentle soul. We are being asked to give the liquor industry what it wants, which is one of those lackadaisical, casual sheriffs, out there in the middle of nowhere, who doesn't have much to do, so they say, hey, we like the way that guy enforces the law because we can sell liquor to kids if we want to, and we want it fixed so that before anything can be done, the sheriff has got to ring a triangle like the dinner bell and tell them, here we come, so we can get ready. That's what this committee amendment is. It's not a compromise, and I'm going to do what I'm doing today on other bills to try to get people to start bringing us well-drafted, meaningful legislation, and not trying to do a fast shuffle and misrepresent what it is. This is not a compromise. The word "compromise" is used too much on this floor. Nobody, who is selling the drugs, gave up anything in this amendment. They got more than the green bill would give to them. You give them the store. The State Patrol is not any threat to them in any of the stings they conduct, and since they do it out there in that area, they might even tell the retailer, we got to go through this ever so often, and we'll be hitting your place sometime between Monday and Wednesday. We don't want to tell you the exact date, so if anybody asks you, did we tell you when we were coming in, you can truthfully say no. Why do they want the State Patrol's method? Because it is not effective. If it was effective, do you think they'd want the State Patrol doing this? Certainly not. It's not uniformity. Why do you think they want to get a state law on some of these things and say include in that that the localities cannot draft an ordinance which is stricter than the state law? Because they feel they can bulldoze this Legislature easier than they can do all these different municipalities, that the people in those localities are closer to the public who will be affected if