

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

January 23, 2004 LB 304

resisting this, it's usually the case that Senator Chambers has supported the people at the bottom of the hierarchy, the minions, the people who are told what to do, the people who have to follow the orders, the people who are probably at risk of the arbitrary decision making of the leader, or the putative leader who's at the top of the hierarchy. Generally speaking, I think Senator Chambers has always had a sympathy for the people who are trying to follow the rules underneath and want to know what the rule book is. That's what I think the general tenor of this amendment is and the general goal of LB 304. I think the idea of writing minimum due process procedural guarantees for, in this case, a very unique job, that match that job and sticking them in the statutes so that border to border, no matter who the hierarchy is mastered by, that people in the law enforcement field at the bottom of the pyramid get treated fairly. That's, I think, a legitimate goal. My sympathies are with the amendment and with the bill. Look, I'd pay attention to any logical, sensible amendments, but in the past it's been hard to come up with what those would be given the moving position of the opponents. They've not been clear with exactly what it is that they can live with and what they don't want, and it's been a moving target. If that moving target moves to the floor, fine, so be it. We can work through this stuff. We can get through this stuff. But, as a general principle, Senator Chambers, myself, Senator Bourne on other areas have generally found that due process minimums for people at the bottom of the hierarchy is a good thing. I got to think that it's possible for us to do the same thing here. I hope we get to that business.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Landis. Senator Maxwell, on the motion.

SENATOR MAXWELL: Thank you, Mr. President. I really have no special expertise in this area, so I don't plan to say much. I have read the words of the amendment before us. I'm not going to pretend that I understand all the implications of everything in there. I've been listening to the concerns raised by Senator Chambers and Senator Bourne. They sound legitimate. I'm not convinced, though, that the changes that are before us now should derail the bill. I'm going to suggest that what we may