

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

April 10, 2000 LB 1021

express, at the very beginning of this discussion on General File, that I think the Unicameral has had a very clean record. We've had accountability and disclosure laws, I think, for 24 years now, Senator Beutler, is that about right? And we've just never, ever experienced anything in the way of a scandal. I want to make clear to people that I don't believe that there has ever been a suggestion of that. I guess I'm not going to support this. I'm not...I have mixed emotions about it, but I think it's just going to require a lot more recordkeeping, and I'm not certain that it would be to much avail. And, Senator Beutler, you can argue that point when I'm finished here. I'm willing to listen, but I don't think I'm going to support this particular amendment. I think we've done some great things here with this bill that are going to make everything reported more accurately, and I think the \$50 limitation has been in effect for a long time. Clearly, not everybody on the floor understood the \$50 limitation, but I think the lobbyists do and I think it's worked well. And I'm not certain I see a need to change that part at this point. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Senator Coordsen, on the Beutler amendment.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Well, that was quick. Almost burned my finger on the button. Senator Crosby raises, I think, an interesting comment. This bill to me has always presented quite a dilemma because, quite frankly, as Senator Schimek indicated, 24 years our current laws have been on the books, 24 years of reporting, 24 years of having made public gifts of substance, those over \$100, and 24 years of the opportunity for people who are interested in those sorts of things to look at who went where with whom, because they are reported at over \$100, and to try to make a decision that those travels, those admissions, whatever they might have been were somehow wrong because, why? Because they were reported? If Nebraska had not been and the people who work in Nebraska, with all of our warts and wrinkles, had not been for 24 years so intent on doing the right thing and doing that in an honest, straightforward and above the board fashion, we might have some reason to examine our statutes. But I've almost got to the point here this morning to ask the question of, is this a trip that's necessary for the body to make? Yes, I recognize that there is in fact overreporting by