

February 1, 1996 LB 964

200 years to maintain the integrity of the ballot, to do away with undue influence; in Nebraska it's 200 feet, I don't know what it is in other parts of the country. It just seems like this is too much of an opportunity for undue influence to be done to voters. And in some of the controversial issues that we have, bond issues, where we're spending large amounts of money, there is just...and many times the voting is very tight, very close, it just seems to me that this is something that we ought to be very careful. That's one of the reasons I supported Senator Schimek's amendment. I think it ought to be across the board. But as I said earlier, I was not really comfortable with supporting the bill and I'm strongly leaning toward opposing the bill at this point.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Wehrbein. Would like to pause one second to recognize a stranger who's entered the Chamber, a woman from Norfolk, Nebraska. I believe her name is Connie Day, is that the correct name? Connie, could you wave to us and say hello, please. Very good to see you back here, Connie. Senator Witek, on the amendment.

SENATOR WITEK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body. I rise in opposition to the Schimek amendment. The Cudaback bill came through the Government Committee and we had discussion on it. And our reasons for keeping it exactly the way it was and for voting it out of committee exactly the way it was was there were some of us, myself included, that definitely had some...and David Bernard-Stevens is exactly right, and I'm sure you would have brought all these things up in committee, were you still in the Government Committee. But we did have some...some reservations about this bill. This is Senator Cudaback's priority bill, he wanted the bill out. And we talked about, okay, we would bring it out because we viewed this as a pilot program almost for the state of Nebraska. They have had problems with this in other areas of the country. We thought if this is good in a smaller area where, you know, saving some money within those areas, saving some property tax dollars, you know this is part of the discussion that we had, that that would be a good thing to do. There was...it's a smaller area, possibly easier to have oversight over, and some of these problems that Senator Bernard-Stevens and others have discussed here on the floor this morning would be...you'd be easier to contain them, to keep an eye on them, to make sure that they didn't happen, or if they were happening to stop it from