

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

January 24, 2003 LB 78

SENATOR CUDABACK: Do you yield, Senator Hartnett?

SENATOR HARTNETT: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Hartnett, I don't see any way this bill can be salvaged. So you, at least, I hope, understand what my position is on the bill, and we can argue it further. Would you agree to that?

SENATOR HARTNETT: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. That's all I have, Senator Hartnett. And in the...did you say I have another minute, Mr. President?

SENATOR CUDABACK: You have about ten seconds, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Oh, then I won't...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Connealy.

SENATOR CONNEALY: I appreciate the discussion, but the part of a large city rules being used by a small city doesn't give me any sway. But what I was interested in in this bill was that...it was efficiency. The main purpose of the law enforcement officer being there to issue the citation was just following the rules. The new...the enforcement action by the inspector was going to be a trained function. Under this bill, the inspectors have to get training so that they write the citation correctly. The...we heard testimony in the hearing that the law enforcement officers would have to go to county court. And sometimes you'd get a continuance. And so then they'd go again, and you'd get another continuance, so that you'd end up having both the city inspector and a city law enforcement officer going to maybe 30 miles away to the county seat on multiple occasions for a small violation, and then eventually the violation was corrected, and you'd have time, money, resources tied up, when actually the law enforcement officer's only function was to go to court and swear that this citation was issued. He would not be asked if the violation was