

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

April 28, 2003 LB 265

about problems with the bill, the undue burden placed on sheriffs which they could not properly assume and handle, even if they were of a mind to. There has been specific discussion of various law enforcement groups who have come out in opposition to this atrocity. Senator Mossey has tap-danced around the fact that the Omaha police union is not the police division, not all Omaha police officers belong to the police union. The question of whether or not to support this bill was never submitted to the membership. There was no vote, no formal action of any kind taken. So that portion of the union, meaning the president of the union, and a few of the officers, which are fewer in number than the Police Chiefs Association, decided to say they'll take a neutral position. Now Senator Mossey wanted to lecture to us about the lack of credibility of police chiefs, the chief executive officers of police agencies. Yet he thinks we ought to accept what the chairman or president of the police union said when he is not even speaking for the membership. Senator Mossey had to acknowledge that that membership is sharply divided. Yet nobody has taken a formal position because no action was put to the membership that would allow a formal position to be taken. So the president of the union, on a hunch, decided to say that the rank and file police officers not only are not worried about this bill but they favor it. I think that is not a valid position. When you look at where we are and where we are tending, it is clear that three hours of legislative time will be burned off the clock and maybe Senator Tyson will try to get a cloture vote and maybe he won't. But if he tries and fails, things will have been delivered into my hands. Senator Tyson, just so that...let me embark on what I was going to say the next time I'm recognized. But what I'm trying to do is to kind of give an overview of where we are on this atrocious bill. There are terms in this bill such as "eyesight power" or "power of eyesight" which is phraseology unknown to any science that I'm aware of. Now "visual acuity," which was one of the proposals I had suggested to make more appropriate the language of this bill is not going to be considered. There is a provision that would hold sheriffs immune to liability even if they are negligent or reckless in granting one of these permits. I don't think that is wise. It would make more sense to put these sheriffs on their p's and q's if you're going to place this awesome responsibility in their