

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

April 4, 2005

LB 588

of these principles. But there's a caveat there. And I'm trying to eliminate the caveat by insisting on the peer review taking place before diving into the confidential records at the Department of Revenue. I think that is very important. We see reports flying around. And it's frustrating, I think, sometimes when we find out that we're not really comparing apples to oranges...or, apples to apples. It's different. It's difficult to sift through the information. But yet, we have these government auditing standards, and we want to uphold those. But Senator Beutler's amendments fall short of making sure that a peer review takes place beforehand, before they go into these confidential records. There are a lot of states that don't even allow it, period. But we're a unique scenario here, that even if we had a report, I fear...if we had a report without the peer review, it lacks the legitimacy that's necessary for others to say, this is the real thing. They would call into question, if for no other reason, absolutely no other reason than just the fact that it lacked the peer review. So all of a sudden, we've expended vast resources from the legislative branch of government, be they intellectual resources or financial resources, and that report doesn't have any legitimacy, again, if for no other reason than there was no peer review. This is reasonable. This is very reasonable, to have this peer review take place before sifting through the highly confidential records at the Department of Revenue. Mr. President, I would ask that FA141 be withdrawn. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: It is withdrawn. Back to discussing AM0942. Senator Beutler. And this will be your third time, Senator. Did you wish...further discussion on AM0942? Seeing no lights on, Senator Smith, you're recognized to close.

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President. I know that I've stated my case here. In my closing on AM0942, please know that I just dropped that two-year restriction, so that this would be immediately prior to conducting the performance audit. We could carry forward, if this is attached. Otherwise, I have grave reservations in terms of the application of LB 588. I want to be a team player here and move forward with something that the objective is well intended, trying to come up with good policy. But I ask, I beg, for caution in the handling of confidential