

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

March 13, 2006      LB 786

others may oppose some of my amendments and argue successfully that they're unnecessary. And if I can be shown that, I'm not going to delay a long time on any one or all of these amendments simply for the purpose of delay. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. (Visitors introduced.) Open for discussion on the Chambers amendment to the Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee amendments to LB 786. Senator Beutler, followed by others.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature, I first of all would congratulate Senator Mines and Senator Schimek for bringing to us this year, and I'm glad to see in my last year, a long, long needed reform in this particular area. It's also a very important area, and there are a number of changes in this bill that I think should be discussed, and I want to throw out some things to Senator Mines and Senator Schimek to see how they react. Senator Chambers, by his amendment, is taking us to a certain area of the bill right now. And although my questions in this area are not as important to me as my questions in other areas, I'd just as soon, since we're on the topic, though, start in Senator Chambers' area, which is the definition of malfeasance, misfeasance, and nonfeasance. Those terms, compared to current law, greatly restrict the reasons for which one can ask for a recall, and that's entirely appropriate, in my opinion. But I would ask whether in two areas perhaps it's not overrestrictive, in practical terms and in terms of what people out there would like to see. When they see how we've changed this, they're going to feel cut off to a certain extent, because something really wrong has to have been done now, once this bill passes, as opposed to taking a wrong position on an issue or having dealt harshly with a neighbor's cat or whatever. So there are two areas where I wanted to ask, should we loosen up a little bit? And Senator Chambers brings this question right into focus, because he's reemphasizing the "in office" part of the malfeasance, misfeasance, nonfeasance, that is, limiting recall to violations while in office. Well, as you know, in the recent matter of Regent Hergert, we got into "in office" versus things that happen during the election process but which may not have been discovered until after a person was in office and elected. We've also talked about other