

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

April 25, 2003 LB 265

SENATOR TYSON: I have no way of knowing that, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Had he been there, should he have made note of who voted for it rather than saying he had to send to get this information, does it seem to you?

SENATOR TYSON: Well, Senator Chambers, there are any number of associations for various purposes throughout the state.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Tyson.

SENATOR TYSON: The...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'm not going to let you tap-dance away all my time right now, maybe later.

SENATOR TYSON: Well, why not, Senator Chambers? You could learn something.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: We'll have an opportunity. That's all I'll ask you right now. Members of the Legislature, if this sheriff doesn't know whether he attended the meeting where this action took place or not, that lets you know how much credence you ought to put in anything he says. If he was not there, he obviously didn't consider the meeting and the issues to be discussed important enough for him to be there. But Senator Tyson's bringing to us the comment from a sheriff who was not at a meeting, who did not participate, does not know who was there participated, therefore, the body should disregard the position that the organization took, would be similar to Senator Tyson saying he was not here when a vote was taken on a bill so the vote ought to be disregarded and that act should not be considered the act of the Legislature. We all know how all of these organizations arrive at a position, so when Senator Tyson says one sheriff told him there's a lot of support in law enforcement, the guy is arrogant, not Senator Tyson, the guy who said that. He thinks because he feels a certain way that's a lot of support. Senator Tyson said a majority of the sheriffs he talked to are for this bill. Well, he could go beyond that. He could say they unanimously are for it, but if his grammar was