

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

March 29, 2006 LB 940

now the burden is to meet what the statutory language is. And if we're going to meet the statutory language, then that also means that if we don't meet the statutory language we could be subject to lawsuit and other remedies that would be allowed. So we need to proceed cautiously. I'm not opposed to what's the...to the idea. I am going to vote against this amendment which would adopt Section 5. That would take it out of the bill, would allow us the opportunity to work between now and Select File to come up with something that would address a lot of these concerns and making sure that before we would go forward that we would have that opportunity. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Erdman. Senator Chambers, on the first portion of the divided committee amendments.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I'm going to just ask Senator Schimek this question because I'm starting to work on some language not to be offered at this stage. But, Senator Schimek, I'm looking at the...and by the way, I'm not going to vote to eliminate this material from the amendment. On page 6 where we're talking about the exemption of the policy group, first of all, so that there's a context in which my words can be understood, since we have open meetings requirements, I think those requirements should apply to every entity, body, agency, and so forth, period. And then where we lay out reasons that would allow for an exception, those reasons would apply to every agency, body, and whatever that is covered. Since you're creating a policy group, I think it might be justifiable to make a reference to how open meetings laws, rules, and regulations would impact on them. So what I would rather see instead of a blanket exemption is to say something to the effect, and I don't have the language for it yet, as you have it here, the policy group shall not be subject to the open meetings act and these designated sections if the business to be transacted is of such nature that it should be kept from the public, or something like that, instead of just a blanket exemption, because they could meet just...let me put it this way. I don't think everything that they are going to do should be exempted from public scrutiny and public awareness. I won't go into detail on it, but this notion that the President had