

April 3, 1989

LB 592

feel that this bill sends that message, that we can cut that connection, we can signal something and then that most of us, and I think I speak for everyone here, is not going to sit down and look the other way, I certainly am not. There is a conference in Omaha on Wednesday and I intend to attend part of that, and others perhaps will too in order to see that this problem might be solved, the root of the problem not just as we might say the end result of the problem. So I just stand against the IPP motion.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Bernard-Stevens, followed by Senators Moore and Landis.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. President. I, too, along with Senator Chambers have some concerns about the bill, although I certainly don't have any concerns about the good intentions of Senator Abboud and others that are supporting the bill. I understand what they're trying to do and philosophically what they're trying to do is very laudable. I just recently spoke with a group, in fact, it was last night, of law enforcement, fire fighters and EMT personnel. One of the things that struck me in conversations with them is their utter frustration. And a lot of their frustration, I think, comes from bills such as this where the Legislature looks at the end result. We window dress a little bit at the end result. After everything has actually gone on through the system now the Legislature looks at it. And the frustration they have is when will the Legislature give us the tools we need to fight the problem down in the trenches. Right now we are so thin, we are so overstretched at the State Patrol, in the county sheriffs, and the city police forces, we are so undermanned and overstressed we can't find enough people to be the undercover, we can't find enough people to get into the areas that we really to to find and convict the people under the current laws we now have. This particular bill, if passed, wouldn't be necessarily a bad bill. It certainly...it just won't do anything to solve the problem. In theory, it's almost as if you're getting to a death penalty argument, do you believe that stiffer penalties would have stopped the person from, in fact, selling in the first place, or if you believe in stiffer penalties on a death sentence was actually going to keep the person from committing the crime in the first place. To some degree, you have to begin asking yourselves these philosophical questions. But the law enforcement people I've talked to are so frustrated because the Legislature finds the easy way to attack the problem, that is