

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

May 8, 2003

LB 759

would put bits of bone and metal in them. So when you were lashed with a scorpion, that's what was being referred to, not the animals with the sting in the tail. And the maximum penalty you could usually suffer when the scorpion was used was 40 strokes less one, which meant 39. But it wouldn't be 39 individual strokes. You'd be actually struck 13 times. But with the three prongs, 3 times 13 would be 39. There is no way I can be prevailed on to vote to gouge the smokers. And the liquor industry has told us, you can't touch us. What is in Senator Brashear's bill right now is immoral, from my position, based on my standards. And what do I mean by immoral? Not something that would take a person to hell, if you believe in those kind of things. It carries me so far away from what I believe to be right that I would have to be referred to as a wrongdoer, a malefactor. That's how wrong, according to the standards I apply to myself, I would be if I agreed to this bill, which is a tribute to the liquor industry. In the old days, when the Barbary pirates...and the Barbary Coast was where Libya is...were making ships from all the nations pay tribute,...yeah, they did, the pirates said, your ships cannot go through these sea lanes unless you pay us what we tell you you're going to pay. Well, some American was a phrase maker in those days, and said, millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute. And that was okay, because the tribute never was as small as one cent.

SPEAKER BROMM: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Always at the crucial point. But thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Beutler. Is Senator Beutler in the Chamber? Senator Beutler waives. Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, generally speaking, I don't get caught up in the floor debate often. And as yesterday was evidence, we went a long time without any rebuttal, because Senator Chambers' arguments didn't need rebuttal; they were simply factually wrong. They were not true. They were mischaracterizations, and just not so. But I