

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

March 13, 2006      LB 786

situation is true, and I don't think you want that. I don't think you want the courts determining, on anything other than a criminal basis, whether or not malfeasance or misfeasance has occurred. And you sure don't want it by a preponderance of the evidence standard, in my estimation. If there...if the grounds exist, there is an election; if the grounds don't exist, there isn't an election. What does that mean, then? The grounds exist. If the grounds exist, won't the public treat the court's action...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time, Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...not as what's stated in the statute, but what I think popularly it will be treated as, and that is that the malfeasance...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time, Senator.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...exists. Was it time, or one minute?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time, Senator.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you. Further discussion. Senator Beutler, followed by Senator Loudon.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature, I want to turn, if I can, to the affidavit and the court proceedings section of the bill also, because I think Senator Landis is going to the heart of some of the questions that are in the bill. And the nature of this proceeding and what it decides and how it decides it is a very, very important aspect of the bill. And let me start asking some additional questions about it. And again, I don't...I'm not in Senator Landis' position, if his position is, we can't do better here and the thing is what it is and so be it. I think we can do better, and I suspect that Senator Mines and Senator Schimek are on the right track here, and I want to see them get there. To that end, I want to explore how this public hearing would be structured. First of all, let me ask this question. Is