

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

January 23, 2004    LB 304

"administrative proceeding," it defines "formal investigation" as well as "informal investigation," and provides provisions for each, and it provides for a definition of "interrogation" in Section 3. Section 4, requirements are addressed when a police officer is under formal investigation. "Formal" was added to satisfy a definition. Section 4, part (3), added: if any employer chooses to record the interrogation of the peace officer or any party affiliated with the investigation, the employer shall notify the peace officer in writing. The original version of LB 304 required a recording mechanism for any interrogations done. This scales that back immensely. Now it is up to the department themselves as to whether or not they will have recordings of the proceedings. And if they decide to record, they shall advise the police officer of such. In Section 4, part (4), as well, references to representatives or choice of an attorney have been amended to state only representative. And again, the mandatory recording clause is deleted. Section 4, part (9), and Section 4, part (10) have been deleted to reconcile for the droppings of the recordings requirement. Thank you, Senator Cudaback.

**SENATOR CUDABACK:** Thank you, Senator Synowiecki. (Visitors and doctor of the day introduced.) On with discussion on the first part of the divided question, Senator Bourne.

**SENATOR BOURNE:** Thank you, Mr. President, members. I in general agree with the concept of LB 304, but I have some problems with the drafting of it. Now, I will tell you that I talked to Senator Synowiecki this morning, and he indicated that the lobbyists for some entity or organization drafted the green copy of the bill. I got home last night about 9:30, spent a little time with my wife and son, and then started reading the green copy of LB 304. This morning we get in here and we understand that there's a complete rewrite. And I again assumed that that was the lobbyists that delayed getting the amendment to Senator Synowiecki. But I'll tell you, I was up till 12:30 at night reading this, and here this morning I find out that that...I could have been sleeping. (Laugh) And I kind of resent the fact that this is such a mess, and it is no fault of Senator Synowiecki's. I don't know which lobbyist delayed getting this amendment back to him, but I have not read the new