

May 8, 1973

that they can own stock in a corporation as long as they don't, the principal source of revenue from that corporation, is not from the liquor license that they happen to hold incidently, and that they do not participate in the management. I would move the adoption, the amendment of Senator Schmit's amendment with that, with this amendment.

PRESIDENT: All right, chair recognizes Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, I'd like a point of order. Since, what Senator Goodrich is offering to do, can be taken in two steps and he admits the first step of his, is substantially what Senator Schmit has done. Couldn't his second part be handled separately, so that each one of these things can be voted on? Because I think they can stand or fall independently.

PRESIDENT: The chair would rule that we could divide the question. I see nothing the matter with dividing it, two ways if theres some duplications. Senator Goodrich, do you concur in that? Or not, or see if we can get agreement here?

SENATOR GOODRICH: I have no objection.

PRESIDENT: All right. Thank-you. Now--

SENATOR CHAMBER: Now, may I speak to the amendment? I do not object to the amendment that Senator Schmit has offered and I stated when the bill was on general file, what the purpose of it was. It is to prevent police officers from having interest in establishments with liquor licenses. As Senator Skarda pointed out in Omaha, when I first made the charge, I've made it before the city council, during judiciary committee hearings and every time I made it, the police in Omaha denied that any of them had interest in liquor licenses or establishments with liquor licenses. The World Herald did a bit of digging and prior to coming up with an answer, I sent a statement around to you, they put a brief editorial and I'd just like to read it to you, since it is short, and it has reference to the bill as I introduced it. State Senator Ernest Chambers of Omaha, has provoked legislation to prohibit law enforcement officers from having a financial interest in establishments holding liquor licenses. He said it is aimed especially at Omaha to get the police vice unit clean. Chambers said he thinks some Omaha policemen have financial interest in bars. We would like to see Senator Chambers for a change, provide some factual backing for his suspicions. The official version is that no Omaha policemen has an investment related to a liquor license. That is the official version from the police department, that no officer has an interest in an investment related to liquor license. The proposed law sounds all right to us, even if there are questions about the rational behind it since it's introduction. No one in a regulatory capacity should have an interest in a liquor operation. The situation Chambers wants to cure, might not exist, but a preventive measure would not be objectionable. A bit more inquiry by the World Herald came up with the discovery that some Omaha police officers do in fact have interests in establishments having liquor licenses. In the same article that I sent around to you, it states what the police chief said, that before the city council of Omaha took away his authority to make certain regulations about police officers, he advised them not to work in establishments having liquor licenses and not to have any interest in an establishment having a liquor license, but low and behold when this bill was introduced to make his opinion of a matter of law, he sent down Captain Stokes to oppose the bill, the policemen's union from Omaha, came to oppose the bill, but no other law enforcement agency in the State and this, after the denial of the charge that I made, he attempted to imply that I was besmirching the police department and lying. Now as far as Senator Goodrich is concerned, his amendment, I, our discussion of it, he did not break off the discussion. I did. The discussion