

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

February 7, 2000 LB 204

where Senator Tyson is concerned, but I think...I felt that I tried to explain that. I thought Senator Chambers explained that, that if there is a pattern set out there, and the officer varies off of this pattern, then I think the supervision has the right to come out and talk to this person; maybe schedule other events that would help the individual get back on, maybe running more aircraft, maybe running more radar, maybe holding the vehicle checks, which they do out there periodically. I think there's a lot of ways that this can be dealt with without putting in certain numbers. I wasn't really going to say this on the floor, but I will. The old saying used to be, when I first started out there and for many, many years when we didn't have a quota, that was the old saying; we don't have a quota, we can write as many as we want to. And I want you to keep in mind that if there is a quota, you've got officers out there that will write that many and that's all they are going to write. If you had a speeder go by him at 100 mile an hour, they are not even going to turn their head because they have got the numbers they need, and I just don't feel this is good law enforcement. I think one of the things that has always stuck in my mind, and I still feel this way today, and I think there was an awful lot of philosophy put into a few words, when I came on the State Patrol, it was Safety Patrol at that time. And Colonel Sanders, not the one with the chicken places, but Colonel Sanders was the head of the Nebraska Safety Patrol when I came on. We're going back a lot of years. But one of the things he told us, and this was prior to the women being admitted into the patrol, one of the last things he said when he gave us our badges was, gentlemen, when you are out there working the road I want you to be visible, and when you make contacts with the public, I want you to treat them like you would want to be treated if you were in their situation. There's a lot philosophy in a few words, and I think because of some of the things that's went on over the years, we've lost a lot of common sense and we've lost a lot of this philosophy. And that's the reason that I have brought this bill here. It's been around a few other times over the years, but this is the first time, I guess, it's ever been discussed on the floor. So I'm going to listen to the debate and I think Senator Chambers is going to put that amendment up there to get rid of the one word, and I don't have a problem with that. So, with that, I will just yield my time back to the Chair. Thank you.