

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

February 23, 2005 LB 7

Denver, you pull up to the stop sign and some guy rushes out there and tries to wash your windows and do a bunch of stuff and he expects a buck or two, and it makes you wonder whether they get run over or what they do. This has been a way that some towns have used to solicit funds for different programs they have. The volunteer firemen use it a lot out in our area, and that's fine in your smaller towns, but when you make laws like this, this covers all sizes of towns, all sizes of villages and all kinds of traffic. So I don't know if this is the best way to raise funds. I think there are better ways to doing it. Seemed like the high school kids do quite well by putting up a sign someplace and offering to wash cars in a parking lot. Perhaps there's other ways that traffic can be diverted with signs or something to safe areas where solicitations can be handled. But to put it out on roadways and in the streets, where there's traffic whizzing by, I would shudder to think that if we pass something like this and somebody got run over some time in the future, one person getting run over and injured or, worse yet, killed wouldn't be worth all of the jawboning we've done here today. So I, myself, really don't support this bill and I think I will vote no on it. And, with that, I'd return my time to Senator Chambers, if he so desires it.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Loudon. Mr. President, Senator Baker's amendment was added to the committee amendment. I'm going to vote for the committee amendment in order to have Senator Baker's amendment attached. Then, should the body decide--and it would be a decision I consider unwise--to pass this bill, Senator Baker's limiting amendment will be a part of it. There will be none of this taking place on state highways. Any roadway that is a part of the state highway system would be off-limits. The only way to get Senator Baker's amendment is to adopt the committee amendment. But if the committee amendment is so objectionable even with Senator Baker's amendment, and the committee amendment therefore would be rejected, I'm sure Senator Baker would then offer his amendment to the bill itself. But why chew the cud twice? The bill should not be enacted into law. But in order that we will have before us the form that the bill at this point will take, in light of the adoption of