

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

February 1, 2000 LB 175

think deeply enough to include any of the contents of the first ten amendments, known as the Bill of Rights, in the original document. So, cruel and unusual punishment is the subject of the Eighth Amendment, and we have a basis for calling that into play on this bill. This bill is cruel, its provisions are unusual and I'm going to continue to discuss it, and I'm going to continue to use the examples that I think make the point. I'm going to read before we're through, if not today, tomorrow or the next day, some of the comments Jonathan Swift had to say about landlords, and it will be for people to judge whether or not his comments that he made when he wrote this pamphlet or tract are true today. And he wrote it in 1729, so Ireland had been having trouble and problems for hundreds of years.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: If a landlord had children and that landlord's children were subject to the same types of things that these landlords do to other people's children, then the landlord would be upset, if the landlord cared about his or her children. But there is no general outcry against a bill like this. Those most profoundly affected by it probably don't even know we're considering it. Things that are written about the Legislature, news accounts related to the Legislature probably are not read by many people other than the senators and the lobbyists, and maybe a few others who have an interest in arcane subjects. So if a bill such as this became law and some of the students and others...

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Time. Senator Chambers, you're recognized to close on your motion to reconsider.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President. If this bill, as I was saying, were enacted into law and students came back to Nebraska, and others who had rented before and left and are going to rent again, they would approach a landlord and be told, you have to plop down two months' security deposit. Some have argued in defense of this bill that a landlord is not required to charge this amount. Well if you think a gouger can gouge \$1,000, the gouger is going to choose not to do it? Why do you think a ceiling has to be placed on the amount that a landlord can gouge? Because unregulated the amount would be