

File. There are committee amendments pending, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Rupp, please.

SENATOR RUPP: Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I'd invite your attention to the committee amendments if you have any sort of an interest in this bill because the committee amendments are the bill in essence. Senator Chambers routed, a couple of weeks ago, this flier that said, for your information LB 687 seeks limit to office of auditors or CPAs, it is not a parks bill, that is correct. LB 687 did authorize the establishment of regional park authorities. That bill was, for lack of a better term and more sensitive term, gutted in committee and LR 22CA was inserted. Very simply, the issue at hand is this, those of you who have been around for other sessions of the Legislature remember all the great Beutler-Newell debates of the past on whether the State Auditor should be required to be a certified public accountant. That is in essence what LB 687 now says. The State Auditor must be a CPA, holding a Nebraska permit to practice, that he or she be a resident and citizen of the United States and Nebraska at the time of his or her election, period. Again, has nothing to do with park authorities. I assume the debate will be over the committee amendments. So I would invite you to listen closely because that is what the bill entails. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Chambers, please, then Senator Beutler. Did you want Senator Beutler to talk first?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

SPEAKER NICHOL: All right. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I did want to give you an additional word of explanation as to why the bill comes up in the form that it does. A couple of years ago I introduced this bill, and I introduced it as a statute. It went through the Government Committee. It wasn't held up in committee. It came out here on the floor and we debated it, as some of you will recall. When it was out here for debate certain members of the Legislature suggested, well, why don't you do it as a constitutional amendment, we would like it better that way. So this time around I took it to the Constitutional Revision Committee.