

May 8, 1973

provides the opportunity for a member of the law enforcement profession to hold a membership in a country club or a professional organization which might have a liquor license and I think that Senator Chambers will speak to the amendment, but as far as I know, there is no objection to the amendment and I hope the Senators will adopt it.

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers is passing. All right, Senator Goodrich, do you wish to be heard on the amendment?

SENATOR GOODRICH: Senator Schmit, would you yield to a question?

SENATOR SCHMIT: I yield.

SENATOR GOODRICH: Senator Schmit, right behind, I presume, there's at least somewhere up there. I have a motion which and I'll read it to you so you can get an a, idea. I had this drawn by Emory Burnett's office, it says this, on page 2 after line 3, which is right exactly where you start, this section shall not prohibit a law enforcement officer from holding a membership in any organization holding a liquor license. This is in essence, American Legion, the VFW, Elks club, that type of thing, such officers shall not, participate in any manner in the management or administration of the organization. In otherwords, I'm saying any law enforcement officer may hold stock in an organization which has a liquor license, but its principal source of income is not the liquor license and I'm referring such as, United Air Lines, or railroads or organizations such as this. The reason for this is, that really a law enforcement officer is not a second class citizen. We should not prohibit him from being a member of the American Legion or VFW or Elks club, or something like that. Nor should we prohibit him from owning stock in a corporation that happens to have a liquor license as long as he doesn't participate in the management or operation of the business. What is your reaction to the amendments as I have, read.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Well, Senator Goodrich, my reaction is one of apprehension because you kept me here unaware and knowing the extent of your amendments, they usually go beyond what appears to be, the original intent and so without knowing more about that amendment, I'd hate to give my unqualified support, because I think my amendment takes care of what I had in mind, in so far as your amendment is concerned, and the additional area which you intend to cover, I would leave that question up to Senator Chambers, who's bill your going to amend.

SENATOR GOODRICH: All right, now I tried to talk to Senator Chambers, I gave him a copy of this and tried to discuss it with him, but I couldn't even get him to simply discuss the matter. So I broke off the conversation, we let it go at that. Now Senator Schmit, yesterday on this floor, you said a, made a comment, to the effect which in effect reflected upon the integrity of the amendments that I offer on bills. You have just done it again. I want you to know publicly I resent this Senator Schmit. This amendment is just exactly what it says. That is all it is intended to do. Now there is one thing, that I have in mind, that is not covered in here and the only reason I have not covered it in here, I haven't even talked about it, that is the decision that we're going to have to make as a body and that is whether or not, we let police officers work in organizations and take for example, Aksarben, if for example, they did not have their own police force. They, may want to hire off duty policemen, to work, to maintain order where there is a large crowd. That however is a separate issue, not included in this amendment. We will take that up at a different time, but all I have in mind, all I had in mind, is what is said in this amendment and I would move that Senator Schmit's amendment be amended to read as my amendment is on the desk up there. Which is just exactly what I just read to you. It provides that they can have membership which is exactly what Senator Schmit's provides, and it also provides