

January 17, 1974

this body. But if I were Senator Chambers I would be doing' exactly what he is doing today. He wants some change, and God knows I don't blame him. But God knows that I want some change. I'm not sure whether this change would be good or bad, or whether it would make much difference in between. I can envision some changes, but I guarantee would make some changes in those schools. There would be no guess work about it. But when we have a constitutional amendment, some of the people supporting Senator Chambers turn around and vote for a constitutional amendment that would allow for probably the single most important tool for correcting the educational sins in the city of Omaha. But what kind of hypocrisy is this. Obviously this is going to be my last political tenure. The fourth year you won't have to be subjected to this again. I say thank God for you because you've suffered long and hard. And I'm tired of inflicting myself on you. You are too good a people for that. But I want you to know some of the things in my mind. Senator Chambers suggested that I'm politically motivated. I think I've said some things that it will make it rather difficult for me to get elected to dog catcher or anything else in the city of Omaha. But I certainly respect Senator Chambers and I don't have any ill feeling for him no matter what he says about me. Because I'm sure if I think I'm suffering I know he's suffering even more. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: The chair recognizes Senator Cavanaugh.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH. Mr. President and members of the Legislature. I would like to support Senator Chambers motion to override the Governors veto. For the same reasons that we've debated over and over here again. The question now and again comes and was raised whether we need uniformity or whether we support this issue, those from Omaha come down and presented this issue to the rest of you, because we have some doctrinaire commitments to district elections or whether we have some strong compelling feeling that Senator Chambers or a black man of his political persuasion should have representation on the school board. I support this and have supported this bill. For neither of those reasons. I consider both of those reasons superfluous. I am not philosophically committed to district elections. I am philosophically committed to representation of the people who are affected by government, and that they have strong and effective representations and you have the same commitment, every member of this body has that commitment. And whether or not a black man or five black men or whatever could serve on the Omaha school board is superfluous to me. Total irrelevant to the issue. The point is that the various diverse, economic, social, and educational stratus that exist in the city of Omaha need representation and need strong representation. And that can only happen in the city like Omaha. By districts because the broader you spread the electric the thinner becomes the representation. The broader scale you have to appeal to the thinner becomes your commitment to an area or to ideals of people that need representation. In my district I think I know my district well as a legislator. I know that my district is composed of an average age group over 50 years old. I know that my district is composed of an average level of \$10,000. And I also know something about the other Senators districts. I know that Senator Proud's district has an average income of \$15,000, and so the things that affect those people and the things that affect the motivation of the people in Senator Proud's district are very often greatly diverse from what affect the people who live in my district, but if an individual who is concerned with education wants to run for the Omaha school board in Omaha he has to appeal to both the people who live in my district and the people who live in Senator Proud's district, and he ends up not representing either adequately or representing the force that has the greatest political punch. There's a