

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

May 3, 2005

LB 682

what she's suggesting. Well, something very unfair happened in the Regents' race. A scoundrel named Hergert stole that election. And when he paid a little fine, all it did was allowed him to overspend even more than was required. There are three options. This man, if he had a shred of morality, a shred of common decency would resign. I have made it clear to the Attorney General that I'm going to talk to him to see about some prosecution on the criminal violations for this man, because the statute specifically gives the Attorney General concurrent authority to prosecute that the commission has, and for those who might be interested, Section 49-14,133. I also have prepared a little packet that I'm going to hand out. One of the articles deals with cheaters: More students seem open to dishonesty. Electronic devices aid students who cheat. Well, where is the place that ethics are taught; where ethics ought to be exemplified; where the leaders ought to, in their personal conduct, show students what being ethical means? The University of Nebraska, the flagship educational institution. And sitting on the Board of Regents is not only the paradigm of cheating but of law violating, and the students can look at him and see that cheating and law violating not only pays off, you win by violating the law and by cheating. Every time the regents have a meeting, there's a law violator sitting among them, setting an example supposedly. These students are condemned and criticized for cheating. If the purpose is to get ahead in life, why don't they look at the one who has demonstrated success, demonstrated it by lying, cheating and violating the law? There is a certain plateau of spending which requires a person who is not going to comply with the statutory limit for expenditures for an office which, when that level is passed, a report has to be made. This Hergert is responsible by his own action for passing that threshold. He knew what he was doing. He had expressed contempt for the laws that he had violated. No criminal case, other than where a defendant confesses, is usually soived by direct evidence, circumstantial evidence. The court has said you determine intent in a criminal case by looking at the surrounding circumstances. Not only do you have the man's own words uttered publicly, notoriously, brazenly, but you have his conduct which put him in a position to violate the law. He knew when he violated the part about the loans that by giving that money to himself, he was above the allowable limit. He cannot