

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

January 23, 2004 LB 304

Chambers' test. There isn't a way to improve this, which is why, by the way, we're talking about, at this moment, reconsidering a motion to recommit a bill rather than improving the language. Senator Chambers has not said, you know what, I'd sit down, and if we solve this language problem I could...I would get out of the way; I could support the bill. I think Senator Chambers' language...or argument is this: Cops don't deserve a higher level of due process than the constitutional minimums because they don't deserve it given their history of being oppressive in my community, and the Legislature should not give them a benefit given their conduct in the streets. I don't know if that's a fair characterization or not, but I think it's close. There is no agreement that can be reached with that perspective. There isn't a chance to work out language, because no language will satisfy Senator Chambers. I'm not sure why that we're holding out this notion of having a conversation with Senator Bourne to improve the language, when in fact Senator Chambers has 15 amendments and is now spending our time deciding whether we're going to reconsider a motion to recommit which failed. And then ask, well, gosh, we're just not...we're not addressing the language. If we were on an amendment that addressed language I guess I'd feel a little better about it, but we're not. Look, if you wanted to solve the problem, you'd have to do two things. Number one, we'd have to get some kind of a green light from Ernie that says if you got the bill in better shape he'd oppose it but we wouldn't go to the mat and take forever. Secondly, you'd need to have two sides sitting down, and it's hard to know who the two sides are, but I'm going to guess, you're right, there is a representative on behalf of the cops' side, if you will, and I think the sheriffs wind up being on the other. Senator Bourne, I think, has...you know, is interested in this. I think there are members in the Legislature who would be interested. My guess is that Senator Brashear casts a very skillful eye on bad drafting, and if the drafting needs to be bettered, that's fine. However, the ideas that are in here, I don't know about you, but I'm not offended by the ideas that are here. The idea is here that says, look, if you want to get interrogated you shouldn't be interrogated for longer than 14 hours at a time, given your work and your interrogation. You shouldn't be subject to physical abuse in interrogation. You should have notice if you're going to have