

March 5, 1980

LB 605

that has been attacked editorially, that a farm group which puts out a newspaper asks questions about, then you can't answer the questions about what is in your own bill? I think you were kind of dealt the fast shuffle by those interests that said they wanted this bill. The original form, members of the Legislature, was even more atrocious than what you have before you here. So what I hope you will do is read the language of the bill. It does not make conduct illegal. It makes a failure to obey an officer who decides that he does not like what he sees...a failure to obey that officer is what becomes the crime, and I think such a law as that is not needed. If, on the other hand, you do have fighting, there is power in the law right now to deal with that. If a person is making even terroristic threats, there is law on the books to take care of that. We don't need a bill like this which can create far more problems than it could ever solve because the very problems mentioned by the introducer who has admitted he doesn't understand his bill, the very problems mentioned by the introducer can already be covered by existing law.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Time is up. Senator Nichol.

SENATOR NICHOL: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I do support the bill. If you will note who testified in favor of the bill, they feel it is necessary. The legal department of the Judiciary Committee rewrote the bill and the attorneys think obviously it is better worded than the original bill. I think perhaps the problem here is a lot of difference between the way the police department of Omaha operates and other peace officers across the state. I don't know if this is true. Senator Chambers has said they don't always act in the way they should. They pick on certain people and maybe they do, I don't know. I don't live there. I live 450 miles away. But in the area that the Game and Parks Department was discussing and in the area that the State Patrol was talking about, it does seem that sometimes when crowds gather it is difficult to disperse them, and they gave us examples where there may be a crowd of people around two or three people who are fighting. They can't get to the people that are fighting because of the crowd around them. If they were allowed to disperse the crowd, they could get to the people who are breaking the law, if there is anybody breaking the law. The worst that could happen is that they would dispel a crowd now and then that shouldn't be dispelled. So that would be bad. But is it that bad to put all the rest of us in the precarious position because we don't want to infringe on the rights of some people once in a while?

7774