

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

May 12, 1999

LB 267

for the sale of alcohol for liquor nonstudent related activities. Well, this does not disturb any of the existing parties that I know of and I think all parties agree that that's reasonable. Lastly, there is the question of the book. What is the book? The book is now a legal requirement that says if you card somebody you're to get their name and their card number and the like. Senator Baker will tell you this is a long and expensive process. The retailers will tell you the same thing. At one time, it was regarded to be the way out of the problem because we would get people to sign and then, the story went, the retailer would have an absolute defense. If somebody was signed in with an ID, there was no violation of the law for that retailer. That exists now but it does say "shall". Frankly, many retailers don't know that it's "shall" and this is a rule that is not commonly observed. Lots of people know if they go to locations where alcohol is served and there is not carding or if there is carding, there isn't the signing of a book. As a matter of fact, you can go to a concert where alcohol is being sold inside and you will not see a long line of people signing in. It's dispensed with, and yet the law says "shall". Senator Bourne's bill moved that to "may". To me, I think that means this. It means that a retailer has an option. If they use the option, they get a complete defense. If they don't use the option, for whatever reason, then they run the risk of selling to a minor and suffering the consequences. It, in that case, will be a business decision and, as a matter of fact, most legal defenses are waivable. So in this case, I think we create a defense they can choose to use, and if they don't want to, they can take the business risk inherent in moving the business along without using the book but running the risk of having a penalty. If you add all three pieces up together, it's something I can live with and I think it's reasonable. It makes the most important step forward that I'd like to see happen. What I'd most like to see is I'd like to see the Liquor Control Commission have this discretion. Why? Well, frankly, they've asked for it. For the last three years in their annual report, if you look in the Liquor Control Commission, the people we ask to control liquor in this state, the people that we advise and consent to that the Governor appoints, our agency, if you will, to control has turned around and asked us in their annual report, give us this tool. We want it. It's discretionary. It's not mandatory. What is now the option of the retailer is