

May 8, 1973

we have a little parliamentary problem here because Senator Goodrich's amendment does not amend the bill itself. The first sentence remains in the bill and I think it would take just a few minutes time to prepare an amendment which would do exactly what we want to do and I would think, Senator Goodrich, that we should pass over this bill for the time being and then come back with an amendment to do exactly what we want to do which in turn will be exactly what Senator Chambers wants, too.

PRESIDENT: Well, Senator Goodrich, do you care to respond.

SENATOR GOODRICH: Yes. Senator Whitney, please pay attention. You state a wrong thing here. You say my amendment does not amend the bill. That's wrong. My amendment certainly does amend the bill. However, what you should have said is that my amendment does not cover the first sentence which is the only part of the...the original part of the bill says no police officer shall have an interest..period..and that is the broad term, interest, is what we are trying to define. That is the problem that has come up, not the fact that my amendment is not an amendment to the bill because it certainly is an amendment to the bill. All we are trying to do is define what we mean by interest and that, I would concur, it is going to take time. This is all the type of thing that should be done before a bill is even introduced but there are some Senators that are so eager to introduce a bill that they just let it go as a one sentence bill that is so broad that nobody could possibly live with it. Now as far as questioning my motives by Senator Chambers questioning my motives, I would even reverse the thing and say that Senator Chambers is the one who has not come up with any concrete evidence. He has not come up with a single name of a police officer anywhere in the state of Nebraska that has an interest in anything, in the way of a bar or a tavern of any kind, and yet he accuses me of doing that same thing when, in essence, it is his guilt, not mine. (Inaudible)

PRESIDENT: Senator Goodrich. Senator Goodrich, excuse me, but the sole request is to lay the bill over and I've got to call you back, at least, to that point. Like, you know, if you object, fine, object but let's cut out the other remarks, if you would please. What we really need is just dispatch the bill. Do you object to laying the bill over?

SENATOR GOODRICH: No, I do not object to laying the bill over but I, also, object to the chair interfering everytime somebody makes a personal attack on, whether it is me or anybody else, and then the person that gets attacked doesn't get to respond to it. That's what I'm objecting to. Now I have no objection to laying the bill over.

PRESIDENT: Thank you, and as to the other remark, if you care to speak on a point of personal privilege, you have that privilege and the chair will recognize that as long as you do it that particular way. Thank you. Now the question is are there objections to laying LB 45 over at this time. Senator Carpenter, do you object? You do object. All right, fine. Senator Carpenter.

SENATOR CARPENTER: Mr. President, one of the problems the Liquor Commission has is identity of participation in ownership, indirectly basically and sometimes directly. That's one of the problems they have and to attempt to define the interest of a policeman who doesn't have any right to have an interest in the first place. He shouldn't be allowed to do that and the minute you try to refine what his interest is and the limitations extent they exist, you just confuse the issue. Now I don't..I would agree with Senator Chambers. No law enforcement officer with the exception of the amendments that was offered by Senator Schmit, I think it was, should be allowed to hold any interest, remote