

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

May 5, 2005

LB 425

this amount is unreasonable. I don't think it is extravagant. And I think I'm probably the one who ought to offer such an amendment because I have had dispute with governors down through the years. But that has never prevented me from being willing to see that necessary activities are adequately funded. When you look at this transition money, don't just think of the Governor's ball or whatever they call it. I never attended anything like that although I was mightily tempted to do so because I think when they send the invitation they make some kind of comment at the bottom about the kind of clothing you ought to wear. And I thought about going there just the way that I am now to see if the State Patrol or whoever the security personnel are would try to stop me physically at the door, and if somehow I slip through they would try forcibly to remove me. But the whole thing was not of sufficient consequence for me to put anybody to that test. This is the money that would provide funding for all that is entailed in transitioning into office. I'm hoping that you will agree to this \$30,000 increase. It is not going to impair any program. It's not going to shortchange any program. And the \$100,000 total is not an extravagant amount. We can do everything on the cheap if we choose to do so. If we choose to do so, we can just strike all money for the transition and require the new Governor, whoever that person may happen to be, to go to corporations, those who contributed to his or her campaign, and try to gather enough money and maybe have in-kind services contributed to make this activity possible to be carried out. There was, before I offered a bill, a restriction on what could be available to provide travel expenses for the spouse of a Governor or something like that. But at any rate, corporations and others were asked to ante up this money. My feeling is that the spouse is a part of the bargain in a manner of speaking and the Governor would have his or her expenses paid, but it wouldn't be true for the spouse. And I thought there was something very unseemly and inappropriate about that so I was able to persuade my colleagues to change that. And it happened that it took place during the tenure of a Governor with which I was disputing and arguing all the time. Those political arguments should never extend to the operation of the office and what is needed to operate it, regardless of who happens to be occupying it. I think that this modest increase from \$70,000 to \$100,000 is reasonable. If you