

We hope you enjoy your visit to the Capitol City and also to this magnificent building. Now, we're back to Senator Snyder for consideration of the committee amendments to LB 315, Senator Chambers' bill. Senator Snyder.

SENATOR SNYDER: Mr. President, the, I would move adoption of the committee amendments to LB 315. The committee amendments--I don't recall who brought them in, I believe Senator Chambers, you did, did you not?--provide a penalty section that was not in the bill as originally introduced. Very briefly there would be two new sections, both of them are brief. One provides that if an officer should be convicted, be dismissed from his position and fined not less than \$1,000 nor more than, not more than \$500 and not less than \$1,000 and the other one would add the emergency clause. That concludes the words I would have to the committee amendments and again I would renew the motion that they be adopted.

PRESIDENT: Any further discussion of the committee amendments? Question is, shall the committee amendments then be adopted? All those in favor please say aye, those opposed say no. The committee amendments are adopted. Back to you, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, this bill was introduced because of a very great possibility of a law enforcement officer having a conflict of interests if he owns or has an interest in an establishment with a liquor license. Some specific examples were given of an officer having a bar near the bar of a private citizen and in order to eliminate that competition, he could set up a bust of the other place and his would never be raided because the only ones to raid would be the police. I talked to the Chief of Police of Lincoln and also of Columbus and they said their men are not allowed to have any of these kind of interests. The Lincoln Police Chief and this may have been quite stringent said that his men could not even frequent these places to socialize and I don't believe that any law enforcement official anywhere in the State is allowed to do this. So if everything I've been told is true about officers not having these interests, I didn't feel that it would have been controversial and therefore the bill was introduced and I move that it be advanced to E & R Initial.

PRESIDENT: Chair recognizes Senator Snyder, then Senator Schmit, then Senator Krem er. Senator Snyder.

SENATOR SNYDER: Mr. President, members of the body, Senator Chambers did say there would be some opposition, at least one that he knew of and I presume the one he was referring to was me. I did vote against the bill in committee, I will have to oppose it on the floor. Now there were some people who testified, if you look at your committee report in the book, people who testified against the bill include a representative for the Omaha Police Chief, the President of the Omaha Police Union, and I think the question that has to be asked right off the bat is just how restrictive is this? Is it not, is it not so restrictive that a police officer having a share of stock in any corporation doing business that would have a liquor license, would that not make the policeman in violation of this bill as proposed?

(End of Belt #19)

(Begin Belt #20)

I heard the President say there were some other lights on so I'll allow some other people to make their points known but I do hope to, by my opening remarks, draw the attention of the body to just what this bill, the subject matter, what's it's dealing with and the fact that there are, definitely in my mind, some questions to be raised about it.