

February 4, 1980

LB 696

if you happen to smoke a joint, but if you sell an ounce or more, then we are going to lock you up for, I don't know, what is it, twenty or fifty years under this proposal?

SENATOR NICHOL: It increased it from one to twenty to one to fifty, as I recall.

SENATOR DeCAMP: So we are going to lock you up for maybe up to fifty years. I see some of the Pages smiling and looking a little shocked here. Anyway I think you ought to show a little caution before you advance the legislation. That is not to say I favor or whatever the use of marijuana but I also don't favor saying that a significant percentage, a significant percentage of the young people in the university should be locked up for fifty years because Sally happened to sell to Mary part of her marijuana. So I think you ought to run it back for a public hearing or analysis, if you do adopt the amendment. I guess you have adopted the amendment. I think you ought to run it back for public hearing. Senator Nichol has indicated that there apparently isn't that much knowledge about where the amendment came from, the origins of it, the reasons for it or anything else. A public hearing wouldn't hurt it that much maybe.

SPEAKER MARVEL PRESIDING

SPEAKER MARVEL: There is a motion on the desk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Wesely moves to have LB 696 returned to the Judiciary Committee for purposes of a public hearing on the amendments.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Well, I apologize to Senator Nichol and the Judiciary Committee for making the motion in that I don't want to imply that they haven't seriously considered this bill but it just seems to me that anytime you take one bill, have a hearing on that, and then come in with amendments, perhaps these aren't of substance, perhaps they are, but certainly there ought to be a hearing on them. I think this is an example of something when I was outside of the Legislature I always disliked and that was bill gutting, basically, and changing a bill without really public notice or public hearing, and perhaps I am wrong. Perhaps there has been adequate consideration given to public sentiment on this but it seems to me that if we are going to put together a catchall bill for Judiciary Committee, I have got some catchalls I would like