

# FOP 'stunned' by sheriff's comments

**From: Adam M. Streight,  
President**

**Cecil County FOP, Lodge #2**

On behalf of the Cecil County Fraternal Order of Police, Lodge 2, and with all due respect, we are absolutely stunned by the comments made by Sheriff Janney in Thursday's article, particularly his statements that he was "unwaveringly" against binding arbitration because it may cost the county "\$1 million" and that when his deputies pursued collective bargaining last year, he "threw up his hands" and challenged us to do better than him.

During the 2002 election, then-candidate Janney stated, when asked by the membership of the FOP, that he supported collective bargaining with binding arbitration. In 2006, both he and challenger Chris Sutton, while pursuing our endorsement, affirmed to the lodge

their complete support for this process.

In fact, Sheriff Janney stated, "As your sheriff, you have my word, you have my full support, in working with the legislators, to make collective bargaining with binding arbitration a reality."

In December 2007, Sheriff Janney asked for and was afforded the opportunity to address his deputies at our monthly lodge meeting, during which he stated that it was imperative that sheriff's deputies obtain collective bargaining and not accept anything less than binding arbitration, otherwise it would be "collective begging." At no time during or prior to this meeting did he delineate that this process should be for wages and benefits only. Why would he throw up his hands if he supported this from the get go and included it in his last two campaign promises to his troops?

Furthermore, the assertion that the county may have to raise taxes to comply with an arbitrator's decision is simply not accurate. As former Gov. Ehrlich, himself a fiscal conservative, stated in his recent letter, "The county's fiscal condition would be of paramount significance" to an arbitrator. It's never happened in Maryland and the sheriff knows that. Making statements to the public like these, which are without proof or merit, is irresponsible and borders on scare tactics.

Certainly we can have a healthy debate on the merits of this process or any other, but fair play and common decency dictate that for the public to make an informed decision, a stance should be based on fact, not rhetoric. With all respect, the sheriff should be behind his troops and support this process which can only benefit his deputies, his agency, and ultimately, the citizens.