

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

[LB56 LB144 LB371 LB382 LB464 LB597 LB680 LB757 LB758 LB776 LB777 LB855
LB986 LB1024 LB1092 LR427 LR428]

SENATOR KRIST PRESIDING

SENATOR KRIST: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the George W. Norris Legislative Chamber for the fifteenth day of the One Hundred Third Legislature, Second Session. Our chaplain for today is Captain Robert Duskin, Salvation Army Church, Norfolk, Nebraska, Senator Scheer's district. Please rise.

CAPTAIN DUSKIN: (Prayer offered.)

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Captain Duskin. I call to order the fifteenth day of the One Hundred Third Legislature, Second Session. Senators, please record your presence. Roll call. Mr. Clerk, please record.

ASSISTANT CLERK: There's a quorum present, Mr. President.

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Are there any corrections for the Journal?

ASSISTANT CLERK: I have no corrections this morning.

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you. Are there any messages, reports, or announcements?

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, the only item I have is notice of committee hearings from the Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee. (Legislative Journal pages 393-394.)

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Speaker Adams, you are recognized.

SPEAKER ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. President. Members, you've all had a chance to see the calendar and earlier memos, but I want to take a moment to remind you that on Monday of next week I will begin accepting priority designations from you, both committee designations as well as individuals designations. And I'll also begin accepting letters from the principal introducer of bills for Speaker priority designations on Monday. And you're going to receive a memo on your desk, it should be coming around, that will again outline in detail that process. And read that over carefully and if you have any questions you can contact my office as to how that is supposed to happen. It would be my intention, as far as scheduling purposes, that if Monday is that designation date, depending the rate at which I start getting priority bills in, but possibly by the middle of next week to start bringing some of those priority bills if they have been designated, bringing them in and bringing them to the top of the agenda and start working with them. It just depends on how quickly we get them in. Tomorrow, you notice on the agenda, it

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

would be my intention tomorrow to move to Select File at the beginning of the day and to work through tomorrow, work through Friday on Select File. And when we're done with Select next week, move back to worksheet order where we're at and then start bringing some of those priority bills in. That's tentatively the plan. So Monday, designation date. Check the memo so you can see the process, and if you have any questions contact me or my office. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Speaker Adams. Senators, if you've lost a cell phone, mobile phone, see Senator Cook. She found it in our parking lot yesterday. (Doctor of the day introduced.) We'll now proceed to the first item on the agenda. Mr. Clerk.

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, for consideration this morning, LB382, which is introduced by Senator Janssen. (Read title.) The bill was under consideration yesterday; at that time Senator Chambers had moved to amend with FA178. (Legislative Journal page 370.) [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Senator Janssen, would you like to refresh our memories? [LB382]

SENATOR JANSSEN: Thank you, Mr. President and members. I think everybody's memory is fairly fresh on this issue. It's been decades in the making. Essentially, if you like...if you want winner take all, you're going to vote yes. If you don't like winner take all, you're going to vote no on this. That's about as simple as it gets. It's a very straightforward and simple bill. I'm not working the Chamber at all on this as far as voting for or against. It's a philosophical debate that we will have, and be happy to answer questions on it. I would like to say that I appreciate Dr. Jacobsen being here today. And I did have some communications with Senator Chambers yesterday about how he felt. And he may be a little under the weather. So if he is under the weather, the doctor of the day is here. So if he wants to step off and excuse himself today that would be perfectly fine with me. However, I look forward to a collegial debate on the merits of whether or not one would want the winner take all for a Presidential election in our state or the Congressional district manner in which we are presently doing it and we've done it since 1991. Thank you, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Janssen. Senator Chambers, would you like to refresh us on the amendment? Just a few minutes, please. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, this amendment simply is drafted in such a way as to indicate that this is a matter that comes from the "Repelican" Party, Republican Party. It is of, by, and for that party, and the way I crafted the amendment which is before us, you will see it's designed to make that clear. Thank you, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Those wishing to speak: Senator

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

Ashford and Senator Chambers. Senator Ashford, you are recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR ASHFORD: Thank you, members. I was here in the Legislature when we voted on this bill and I wanted to recount that just a bit. I think the question in listening to the debate yesterday, I'm having a very difficult time understanding why under any stretch of the imagination we would want to change something like this. Because we're one of two, we want to change it. I heard that argument, even though we're one of one, obviously, as a Unicameral Legislature. But when that debate occurred years ago and Senator Chambers was the only other member that was there at that time, I don't remember how many Republicans or Democrats voted for it. I know it was somewhat bipartisan. Clearly, it was an effort. Senator Schimek, the argument was, well, gee, we could potentially, it was cast as a Democratic Party thing to get more votes for...in the Second Congressional District or potentially the First, for a Presidential candidate. And there was some of that. But for me I think we have to be very, very cautious about supporting initiatives that suppress voter energy, not so much voter turnout, but voter energy and voter participation. I know that my daughter, Ellie, who now lives in New York, at the time was living in Washington and she came back to Nebraska to...she was a big supporter of President Obama's and she campaigned in Iowa and in Nebraska for President Obama. And she and many of her friends came together and were very active in 2008 in the Second Congressional District and to some extent the First Congressional District and certainly in Iowa. It was really a joy to see. I don't care who these...who people support. But the idea of voter participation is the essence of our democracy. I know I get so...having gone through an election for mayor in Omaha where the turnout is less than 30 percent, and less than 20 percent in the primary because of a law that says you have a mayoral election on an off year, well, that's a rule that suppresses voter participation. It's not good for our democracy. Someone has to come up with some good reason why Nebraska has to be like everybody else. We don't like to be like everybody else. Nebraskans are unique. We are unique politically, obviously, and we're unique in many other ways, because I think we are by nature independent as a people. We may be small, but we're independent and I think we're feisty when we can be. Why would we under any...other than some reason that, as has been suggested yesterday, that one political party wants to go back to voter...the winner take all kind of a system. There is no reason to do it. It doesn't make any difference. But what it does do is it allows people to get more engaged in the campaigns. As I saw, in the Obama campaign in '08, my daughter's participation in that campaign, which was great to see her excitement, coming back to Nebraska, literally, to involve herself in that campaign. We must be very careful on all of these things that we never ever suppress voters participation. We encourage voter participation and certainly voting in the end. But voter participation leads to voting. So we've had one case in the Congressional district, Second Congressional District where the Presidential elector voter for Obama. I don't think it's going to happen that often. There are 180,000 more Republicans than there are Democrats in the state of Nebraska. So I really don't see this as being... [LB382]

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

SENATOR ASHFORD: ...such a radical effort to sway the votes to Democrats over Republicans. The other thing in Nebraska, independents cannot vote in statewide elections either. That's another suppression of voting in Nebraska. So a state that prides itself on its unique political institutions, we need to remove all these silly rules. We need to bring people together on one single principle, and that is get involved in political campaigns on all levels and by so doing increase voter participation and increase our opportunities as a state to even become a greater democracy than we already are with our Unicameral Legislature. So let's not get...I wish we'd get off this thing, quite frankly. We've got some...we have some very important matters to attend to. Let's not suppress voter participation. Let's encourage and enhance voter participation. Let's continue to do what we have done in allowing each Congressional district to vote for their elector, and let's move forward. Thank you, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Ashford. Senator Chambers, you're recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, Senator Ashford toward the end said we have some important matters to attend to. I have one right now. Omaha! Omaha! A-X-2-L! Hurry! Hurry! Omaha! (Laughter) I'm going to get the transcript, send it to the chamber of commerce, and if they will give to Peyton Manning's charity \$500 for each time he said Omaha, I'm going to see if they'll give \$1,500 to my favorite charity, which is Hearts United for Animals. I will give you another reason why I did that. Now I have your attention. You can go back to what you're doing. Senator Janssen was correct. He didn't say it like this. He said if you're for this you'll vote yes; if you're against it you'll vote no. People's minds are made up. Things are being said for the purpose of the record. I don't think that we'll get to a vote on the bill itself. So you'll just have to tell people whether you're for it or against it. He said this is going to be a philosophical debate. Philosophy ranges everywhere on every subject and that's what we can talk about. Everything or nothing. I think the bill is worthless. I feel sorry for my friends who are in the "Repelican" Party. And since I've styled myself the defender of the downtrodden, I now embrace them within the parameters of that designation and they're under the umbrella. And Senator Bloomfield, who is a "Repelican," my protective arms will even include him. You know why I say that? They have a litmus test which says if you want to be considered a "Repelican," then you better do what we tell you to do. And that kind of threat is demeaning to some of you in here who are "Repelicans." But if that's the kind of organization you want to belong to, they drum you out of it if you don't do just what they tell you to do, that's quite all right. You're free to do that. The constitution says so. But you should remember, if you'll accept somebody...advice from somebody who's old enough to be your ancestor, when you are a child, you think as a child, you believe as a child, you behave as child.

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

When you become a man, you put away childish things. And when you allow an organization to publicly treat you like a child and you do not protest, Senator...well, I won't call him into it at this point because he hasn't said much on the bill, but I kind of looked at him, then you give other people leave to treat you like a child. However, I'm not going to treat you like a child. I'm going to treat you the way you ought to be treated if there were great respect for you and maybe you'll live up to it. Because George Bernard Shaw wrote, in Pygmalion, the difference between a lady and a flower girl is not so much in how she acts as in how she's treated. So if you treat people a certain way, it's another way of indicating what your expectation is. And I expect everybody in here to be an adult, and I know that will not happen. I expect everybody to be intelligent in what they do and say, and that definitely does not happen. I'm glad for this bill. It'll give me a chance to speak at great length, but I don't have to worry about what I say because this bill is not going anywhere. As a matter of fact, I would name it Irene, Senator Janssen, because there's a song that the Weavers sang: Irene, good night. Irene, good night. It's good night, Irene, for this bill. There will not be a vote on it. And how much time do I have, Mr. President? [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I don't have enough time to read an article that I intend to read during the discussion, but the headline is "Arizona GOP Censures McCain for 'Liberal' record." That was in the Lincoln Journal Star Sunday, January 26, on page A8, and I'm going to read it to show how this party in addition to subjecting its members to a litmus test cannibalizes them. This is a concrete example of how they say do what I say, you'd better do it. And that little handout I gave you from Grover Norquist, he's a "Repelican." He's so accustomed to "Repelicans" being supine, cowardly, and childlike that the fool made the mistake of sending that to me when I was running for the Legislature. Obviously, he didn't know whom he was dealing with, but he knows now because I wrote him the letter. I did not get a response, but I believe he read it. It's probably on his wall. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Time, Senator. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'll bet he's never had a rhyme, so respectful, sent to him in his life. Thank you, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Bloomfield, you're recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: Thank you, Mr. President. Excuse me for a moment. I had to look to be sure there wasn't somebody from the Republican Party down there going to grab me when I started to speak. I like the idea of the split vote. We were sold this notion 20-some-odd years ago under the pretense that the other states would soon

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

follow. They have not. We have divided our piece of the pie into a smaller piece of the pie while the other states that we were told would come along have not. I, therefore, am going to support LB382 to make our pie just a little bit bigger when it comes to the electoral college. As soon as we get four or five states, give me California, Ohio, and a couple of others, that will actually go to this system, if I'm still here I'll introduce the bill to bring it back. But right now I see no reason to keep our electoral college delegates separated and with less influence than they might have. Again, if we could do this nationwide I think it would be a wonderful thing. But for a small state like Nebraska to divide ours when the big states do not, I think is the height of foolishness. And that's about all I've got to say on it. Thank you. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Bloomfield. Senator Ken Haar, you are recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR HAAR: Mr. President, members of the body, I would like to go over the history of this kind of legislation in the Legislature. I did talk to Senator Schimek, who in 1989 introduced LB1206 to go to the current system. And from what she tells me, the reason was good government, not that we'd have a whole bunch of people following. So I'm just going to go through this, this will give the history, kill a little time. Nineteen eighty-nine, Senator Schimek introduced LB1206. The hearing was February 21 in the Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee and IPPed on sine die. Then in 1991, Senator Schimek introduced LB115; hearing on February 6 in 1991 in the Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee. It passed General File, 25 ayes, 18 nays. It passed Select File with 25 ayes and 10 nays, and then it failed the motion to bracket until 1/10/91. There were only 23 ayes and 25 nays, and then it passed Final Reading on 25 ayes, 23 nays, and 1 abstaining, and was signed into law by the Governor. In 1993, Senator Wehrbein introduce LB166 to reinstate winner take all. The hearing was on March 18, 1993, in the Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee. It advanced to General File on January 19, 1994. It was IPPed on sine die. And I will leave it up to Senator Chambers to maybe relate a little bit more of this history, but I have a feeling that he was involved in the sine...the IPP of this LB166 in 1993. Then in 1993, Senator Kristensen, K-r-i-s-t-e-n-s-e-n, introduced LB233 to reinstate winner take all. The hearing on 3/18/93 in Government, Military and Veterans Affairs; IPPed on 1/19/94. Nineteen ninety-five, Senator Kristensen, spelled with a "K," introduced LB65. It passed on Final Reading, 27 ayes, 15 nays, 1 present and not voting, 6 excused and not voting; vetoed by Governor Ben Nelson. Nineteen ninety-seven, Senator, "K," Kristensen introduced LB103. It passed on Final Reading, 28 ayes, 15 nays, 1 present and not voting, 5 excused and not voting; vetoed by Governor Ben Nelson. Two thousand, Senator Jon Bruning introduced LB1179. The hearing was on February 11 in Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee, and advanced to General File; IPPed on sine die. Two thousand and one, Senator Jon Bruning introduced LB454; a hearing on 2/15/01 in Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee; advanced to General File; IPPed on sine die. Two thousand three,

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

Senator Quandahl introduced LB253; hearing on March 13, 2003, in Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee; advanced on General File; IPPed on sine die. There seems to be a pattern here. In 2006, Senator Langemeier introduced LB894. There was a hearing on February 10, 2006, in Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee; advanced to General File; IPPed on sine die. Two thousand seven, Senator Friend introduced LB433; hearing on 2/22/2007 in Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee; IPPed on sine die in committee. Two thousand ten, Senator Beau McCoy... [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

SENATOR HAAR: ...thank you, introduced LB77; the hearing on 2/24 2010; IPPed by committee as requested by Senator McCoy. LR423 introduced on 3/24/10, 2010, an interim study to examine the way Nebraska awards electoral votes in the Presidential elections. So I hope to get a copy of that study and read it because I think we all need that information. Thank you very much. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Haar. Those still wishing to speak: Senator Avery, Crawford, Wallman, Ashford, Hadley, Nordquist, and Chambers. Senator Avery, you are recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR AVERY: Thank you, Mr. President. I have tried in the past seven-plus years in this body to always ask myself the question, when I am considering a bill, what public purpose the bill serves. And I'm searching for a public purpose in LB982 (sic). I can't see that. Is it LB982? I can't find a public purpose. I can find a political purpose, but I can't find a public purpose. So I'm going to ask if Senator Janssen will yield to a question. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Senator Janssen, will you yield? [LB382]

SENATOR JANSSEN: Yes. [LB382]

SENATOR AVERY: Senator Janssen, you've heard me say this before. You used to serve on the Government Committee. Tell me, convince me that this bill has a public purpose. What is it? [LB382]

SENATOR JANSSEN: Well, Senator Avery, you can't see a public purpose in this, but you also can't see what the number of the bill is, so I have to take that under consideration as we have our discussion here this morning. [LB382]

SENATOR AVERY: I think I got the bill right. [LB382]

SENATOR JANSSEN: Did you get it? [LB382]

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

SENATOR AVERY: Yeah. [LB382]

SENATOR JANSSEN: You're way back there. I understand that. You know, public purpose, and I enjoyed my four years serving on the Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee under your leadership, and I know where you stand on this bill and I know you've been against this particular legislation for the entirety of your service down here and more likely before that. And the question could have been asked to Senator Schimek when she changed this from the way it was for, I would assume, the entire time that the state of Nebraska has been electing our president. What is the public purpose? And we can argue back and forth, like I had talked about, a philosophical debate on whether you think we should separate the vote or if one vote, one person. You can argue both ways on this. And for the public purpose of this, I think it is becoming of a Legislature and it's the responsibility of the Legislature to discuss issues like this. But, look, I think this is much more important... [LB382]

SENATOR AVERY: All right. I'm going to... [LB382]

SENATOR JANSSEN: ...than talking about novelty lighters. [LB382]

SENATOR AVERY: You're using my time, Senator. [LB382]

SENATOR JANSSEN: If somebody tuned in today, I think they would think this was a very important discussion for us to be having as a legislative body. [LB382]

SENATOR AVERY: Well, any discussion we have does not necessarily have a public purpose behind it. I mean, obviously, not everything we do in here serves a great public purpose. There... [LB382]

SENATOR JANSSEN: Clearly this does. [LB382]

SENATOR AVERY: All right. Thank you, Senator. Obviously, you don't know what the public purpose is because you can't tell us. Let me just say, I do not support the electoral college. I think it is way, way past its time. It's an archaic device that was founded on elitist principles at a time when the founding fathers did not trust the people to cast the "right votes." And of course this bill does not significantly alter the electoral college. What it does, however, is affect the ability of Nebraska voters to exercise the opportunity to feel relevant in Presidential elections. And if you go back to 2008, which this is probably about, we found that the Obama campaign opened up three campaign offices in Omaha in the 2008 election campaign. They spent... [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

SENATOR AVERY: ...about \$128,000 on salaries and office expenses. They spent another \$625,000 on TV. Altogether, with including the economic multiplier effect, about \$5.7 million in new spending occurred in the Omaha area. Now if you are looking for a public purpose, maybe you ought to look at what impact the split vote had on the state of Nebraska in 2008. It seems to me that we have to try to figure out what is best policy for the state of Nebraska. Frankly, I've been ambivalent about this bill. I haven't been such a strong opponent of Senator Janssen's attempt to get it repealed. The truth is that if this were...if the Nebraska model were applied nationwide... [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Time, Senator. [LB382]

SENATOR AVERY: ...it wouldn't serve my party. Thank you, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Avery. Senator Crawford, you are recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Thank you, Mr. President. I believe that we could have a philosophical debate over what is best in terms of the electoral college and how the electoral college votes are divided in terms of what's best for the nation, but I want to remind my colleagues our job here in this Chamber is to ask what is best for Nebraska. And what is best for Nebraska? And that's, again, what I come back to again and again. I cannot see any gain for Nebraska from this bill. And I was listening intently in the introduction of the bill, again, for the purpose. What is it? Why are we debating this? Why would we consider moving in a direction that, again, takes away opportunities for people to visit our state, to talk about our state on the media, to bring new jobs to our state, and to mobilize voters of our state? What is the purpose? And I think what I heard in the introduction was the argument that, well, every once in a while we have to rethink these policies. Fair. And, well, have we really had an influx of campaign dollars and campaign attention? Have we had an increase in voter turn out? In the Omaha World-Herald, it states that...Janssen is arguing that we have not seen those. Now those are not philosophical questions. Those are factual questions. And we can answer those factual questions with facts. So, in fact, we have seen an increase in interest in Presidential campaigns. Since this change, we've had three Presidential elections with turnout rates in Nebraska over 60 percent. I talked yesterday about the fact that in Olde Towne Bellevue we had a storefront with paid staff, 18- to 24-year-olds from other states coming to live in our state and work in our state because of the attention that was paid to the fact that we split our votes. I want to talk just for a moment personally about our young people and getting them engaged in the campaign. I've been working at Creighton for almost 20 years now, and I have a passion for getting young people involved in politics. And usually the races that get young people to first start thinking about politics are competitive Presidential races. We know that a lot of the decisions we make here may impact their lives more on a day-to-day basis, but what excites new people about politics are Presidential races. Like it or not that's true. What I see at

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

Creighton is that, race after race, the young people that are interested in getting involved in politics have ended up being asked and recruited to carpool over to Iowa to campaign in Iowa for those Presidential races they are so excited about. So what was so exciting for me to see as a professor at Creighton in 2008 was that my students were recruited to walk the neighborhoods around Creighton and to talk to people about politics in our Nebraska neighborhoods, in Nebraska communities. They were engaged in the election and they were engaged in the election in our state, instead of just being carpooled over to Iowa to be engaged in the election in another state. And I think that's a very big loss. It's so important to be able to have really competitive discussions in our state and get our young people involved. And actually, you know, the Presidential races don't only just bring in young people. I have a very good friend in Sarpy County, and actually the 2008 race was her first entrance into politics. And now she's very engaged in politics at all levels. And so I would venture to say, honestly, that this LB382 is bad for state party... [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: ...both state parties because the Presidential races are such an important tool in getting people started and getting them engaged in being involved politically. So I urge you to vote against LB382. We have seen increase in engagement. We have seen increase in attention. And if you notice how much attention we get just because Peyton Manning says "Omaha" "Omaha," imagine how much attention we get because every time the electoral college is mentioned in the media they talk about Nebraska. Thank you. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Crawford. Senator Wallman, you are recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR WALLMAN: Thank you, Mr. President, members. I find this conversation very engaging and I thank Senator Crawford for what she brought up with the youth. And I don't know what the passion is about repealing something. When every one party is in power a long time, no matter which party it is, it's not always good. You have low voter turnout because you feel like you don't have a voice. And so if we have a voice or any...just a little bit of a niche here to help young people get to the polls and work for whichever candidate it is, I think it's very important. And so I'm against this bill, LB382, and I guess if I had my way I'd go popular election across the whole country without the electoral college. But it was set up by our forefathers because they were worried about who'd get elected. But I keep hearing this is the Nebraska way. Out of Washington, D.C., they don't mention electoral college. So why is this a passion in here? I do not know. Thank you, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Wallman. Senator Ashford, you are recognized. [LB382]

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

SENATOR ASHFORD: Thank you, Mr. President and members. I do think this is an important discussion for a while, but the discussion starts to lose its impact when we don't get an argument that tells us what is good about this bill, what is good for our state. I have a lot of respect for Senator Bloomfield. He has a great deal of common sense. But I don't understand the argument and I've heard it before, why don't we wait until other states do this. Nebraskans, we like being different. We just love it. We love it. We love being different. And I think we have...we don't have a large population, a million, 700,000, whatever it is. Everybody I've served with...the most unique thing about this place in the 16 years I've been here, and I've been blessed to serve with the people I serve with now, and all of the members I've served with, I don't know how many, Ernie is twice as many as I have, but every single person I've served with I've enjoyed serving with because they are all unique and different and they're independent. And, yes, I sort of know what party they are I guess. But generally I certainly don't care what party they are in. And when political parties...I don't care Democrats, Republicans, I guess that's all we generally have, we used to have the American party, but...or the Green Party maybe at one time or another, but whenever they try to stick their nose into...we do here...or when any large organization tries to stick their nose into what we do in this body, this body generally rebels against that. I mean, the old saying about let's bring this issue inside the glass, it means let's decide these issues amongst ourselves. And to me, that's why I came back eight years ago to this place. I mean, I couldn't keep away from it. There's no place like it. There is...and we've all visited other legislatures, I have, and it's like going to a mini-Congress. You know, you have the conference committees and the leaders of the parties in power have the power and the others don't and so forth and so on. And I talked to my colleagues as we all have across the country and I always feel sorry for them. Why, what do you do in your places? I mean, what's it like? When I was here before, Jesse Ventura came down from Minnesota and he wanted to have a Unicameral Legislature in Minnesota. And I think Governor...I can't recall whether it was Governor Brown before, but California had looked at a Unicameral Legislature. Other states have looked at Unicameral Legislature. The fact that nobody else has done it is their problem. That's their problem, not our problem. I mean, we have what is, in my view, the optimum system. Where it gets bogged down, and we should all remember this no matter what our...what the issue is or what special interest is involved in the issue. What is important about this place and what is so powerful about what we do here is we ourselves make the decisions amongst ourselves. Certainly there's outside influences, certainly parties play some role. But we need to minimize that. We need to minimize that in the election process, we need to minimize it in the deliberation process because we are so fortunate to have what we have. People say, well, Senator Chambers, he takes all the time. Maybe he does. He shakes his head. He said, you know what, but look at the number of bills we pass on important measures every year, many of which maybe we shouldn't have passed. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

SENATOR ASHFORD: But we passed them amongst ourselves. We can take responsibility for the constitutional amendment on hunting and fishing and whatever else we can do under the constitution, because we did it. It wasn't the Republican Party or the Democratic Party. It may have been a silly thing to do, but we did it. We do silly things and we do good things. But what is critical about what we do is we do them. We do those things. We created a way to vote for the Presidential electors that raises up, as Senator Crawford has said, raises up our people. Why? Why would we ever, ever do this? We are different! We are unique! We are Nebraskans! So for heaven's sakes, let's be proud of that. Maine, who knows...I don't even know where Maine really is. I know it borders Canada. It's way up in the northeast corner. Maybe Senator Kintner knows where Maine is. I don't know. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Time, Senator Ashford. The Chair recognizes Senator Hadley. [LB382]

SENATOR HADLEY: Mr. President, members of the body, before I stood up, it reminded me of Abraham Lincoln's favorite saying that if you keep your mouth shut people think you're a fool; if you open it, you remove all doubt. So I thought I'd get up and speak for a moment. Senator Haar gave a little talk on the history of this bill. When our class was having the...our orientation, I hope I'm not speaking out of school, but we had Senator Doug Kristensen, who's now the chancellor of the University of Nebraska at Kearney, talk to us. And somebody asked him what vote do you wish you could take back. And he called it the snowstorm/ice storm vote. And that happened to be on LB115. And the day that bill was brought up he said, the Omaha senators, a few Omaha senators, had trouble getting here and they were in favor of LB115. And Senator Kristensen was asked if he would switch his vote from nay to aye on General File just to move the bill to Select and then on Select he could move it back. Well, that's exactly what happened. But there was enough votes to pass the bill. And I find it kind of unique, you'll notice that Senator Kristensen three times tried to rectify his vote by introducing the bill to repeal the bill. So I think we could refer to LB115 as the ice storm bill because supposedly that was one of the reasons it was passed. Thank you, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Hadley. Senator Nordquist, you're recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR NORDQUIST: Thank you, Mr. President and members. Because I think this is the first time, at least since I've been in the Legislature, that Grover Norquist's name has been mentioned, I just want to clarify for the record. Even though we are, you know, some would call us ideological twins, we are not related in any way. I have a "D" in my name, so just to make sure that's stated into the record. Senator Avery asked the question of the public purpose and I don't think we still have a clear answer of the

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

driving public purpose behind this. And in the first introduction of this bill, you know, the argument was we haven't seen the benefits that were promised to us when the initial legislation was passed. And I think that flies in the face of the evidence of the facts. And I think we can just look at...Senator Avery mentioned the hundreds of thousands of dollars that poured into our state during the 2008 cycle, multiple offices opening up, multiple...dozens of staffers, paid staffers on the ground bringing in young people to work on these campaigns. I found an article then following it up in 2012. That's...the headline is, "The hunt for Nebraska's electoral vote," and this was on a national political site, Politico, and it says that Nevada ranked number one in political ad spending per electoral vote according to data provided by a media analyst group. The rest of the list includes the usual swing states with one exception--Nebraska. And they reflect...they say it's a reflection on Nebraska's quirky electoral vote allocations. The state is just one of two that awards electoral votes by Congressional district. Clearly, in 2008 we saw the ramp up, but in 2012 we saw it again. We were on the list of states getting the most ad revenue coming in. And that ad revenue that goes to our TV stations creates jobs. Now Senator Bloomfield talked about the pie. I certainly love pie, but this is about growing the pie, growing our economic pie, and we saw the results of that in 2008 and in 2012. Talking about getting attention, the President's campaign manager from 2008 wrote a book and singled out our one electoral vote in his memoir about the 2008 election, about the focus that their...I think at that point it was getting close to a billion-dollar campaign focused on one electoral vote in Omaha. So I think the evidence from 2008 and 2012 really rebut the point that we haven't seen the benefits of the implementation of the system. The facts are we have. Senator Mello yesterday mentioned his constituents said--go to Lincoln and focus on other important issues, economic development and education. Well, my constituents certainly said that, but I also heard a number of them come to me and say go to Lincoln and make sure this was protected. I had constituents say they never felt more excited in an election season, people who are 70, 80 years old saying this is the most excitement they've felt voting in an election ever was in 2008. And we had people say...I had young people say I've never felt like my vote counted before. This time I feel like my vote really matters. And I've never been more excited. I thought, you know, when they first told me that it was because I was on the ballot in 2008, but in hindsight it's probably because of the closeness of the electoral vote. And Senator Crawford has done a great job talking about the young people engaged. We are always talking about the brain drain going out of our state... [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

SENATOR NORDQUIST: ...of young people, of losing young people. But my question is, what would be better for our society, for our state than to keep young people here who are engaged in their government, no matter which side of the political spectrum you're on, keeping young people here who care about the future of our state to get involved in government? I don't think there's anything better for our state than that. And this is one pathway to get us there. And if I have enough time, Senator Murante

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

yesterday mentioned he was shocked at our, kind of, outrage at the political party being involved. And they...I guess they have the right to pass resolutions, but it should have no impact in this body. Senator Ashford previously has handed out a statement by George Norris on the first legislative session, and he said you are members of the First Legislature of Nebraska to hold your positions without any partisan political obligation to any machine, any boss, or any alleged political leader. So the matter is whatever the political parties do should have no impact inside this Chamber. Thank you. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Time, Senator. Thank you, Senator Nordquist. Senator Chambers, you're recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Members of the Legislature, I'm going to read this article that I touched on, then I'm going to have some things to say about my amendment, which is what we purportedly are discussing. It's an Associated Press article, dateline, Phoenix. "The Arizona Republican Party formally censured Senator John McCain on Saturday, citing a voting record they say is insufficiently conservative. The resolution to censure McCain was approved by a voice vote during a meeting of state committee members in Tempe, state party spokesman Tim Sifert,"--S-i-f-e-r-t--"said. It needed signatures from at least 20 percent of state committee members to reach the floor for debate. Sifert said no further action was expected. McCain spokesman Brian Rogers"--no "D," R-o-g-e-r-s--"declined to comment on the censure. McCain isn't up for reelection until 2016, when he will turn 80. He announced in October that he was considering" returning "for a sixth term. According to the resolution, the 2008 Republican Presidential nominee has campaigned as a conservative, but has lent his support to issues, quote, associated with liberal Democrats, unquote, such as immigration reform and to funding the" law sometimes known as Obamacare. "Several Republican county committees recently censured McCain. Timothy Schwartz, the Legislative District 30 Republican chairman who helped write the resolution, said the censure showed that McCain was losing support from his own party. Quote: We would gladly embrace Senator McCain if he stood behind us and represented us, Schwartz said. Fred DuVal,"--D-u-V-a-l,"--"a Democrat who plans to run for Arizona governor, called the censure an, quote, outrageous response to the good work Senator McCain did crafting a reasonable solution to fix our broken immigration system, unquote." Members of the Legislature, when it said that Rogers, a spokesperson for Senator McCain, would not comment, he knew that the Associated Press prints articles which run in family newspapers, and the kind of language that he would have used to properly and adequately describe what had been done could not be printed in a family newspaper. So he followed the admonition of Abraham Lincoln, paraphrasing: He kept his mouth closed and did not say anything. This fellow who had help engineer this said they would gladly embrace Senator McCain if he stood behind them. Senator McCain would not stand behind them because there's only one thing that would happen if he stood behind them. There would be a reflexive action in his right leg raising his right foot to apply it to the appropriate portion of the posterior region of this

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

person. And Senator McCain is too much of a gentleman to do that was what I thought. But Senator McCain said he did not wish to befoul his shoe by putting it on that person. Now what I'm doing is taking poetic license and speculating about what had been perhaps in Senator McCain's mind. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But here's what I'll venture to say. Even though Senator McCain has taken positions with which I disagree, as has every person at the federal level, local, and state level, Senator McCain has done things that are noteworthy. I don't think he has anything to fear from this rump group who would censure him. I'm sure he lost a lot of sleep about it because it took from his mind concern about what's happening in Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, the drone problem, Guantanamo Bay. But I want him to know that there's a person in Nebraska who says: Senator McCain, you've done some good work and don't worry about things from the peanut gallery. Thank you, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Those still in the queue: Senator Johnson, Kintner, Schumacher, Ashford, Murante, and Chambers. Senator Johnson, you're recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. President. In 2012, I was a candidate to be in the Legislature. I did have a lot of pressure from the party that I'm affiliated with. The first thing I learned was somebody looked up on Google, which is pretty accurate at times, that found out I was a registered Democrat, which surprised me, also surprised the Governor. Governor called me in and said--are you a Democrat? Said he didn't think so. And I said, no, I'm not. That's when I first learned that, boy, you know, we're nonpartisan, but people are looking at that. I've tried in my campaign, I even asked the party not to send out material supporting me. I wanted to do it on my own. I think they pretty much followed that suggestion, but they did get involved at a point. When I came in here, I didn't try to look up to see who's Republican and who's Democrat. I don't know yet. I got a letter from the Republican Party saying that they're going to honor the Republican candidates or senators that are term limited out. I think that number is nine, if I remember the letter right. So I thought myself--I don't know for sure who the nine are. I've tried to stay as nonpartisan as I possibly can. Today, in this discussion and somewhat yesterday, I started learning, because of the comments that were made, who's on which side and who's in which party. That's all I'm learning from what we're discussing right now. And I think that continues to divide us. It continues to split our nonpartisan approach to things. If Senator Chambers says that he feels this will not come to a vote, last year I went out on a limb a little bit and said I think we need a vote on Medicaid expansion, and we ended up not. But I felt we were told to come down here and vote our conscience, vote for the best thing for the people. We're not a different group. I look at it as--we look at things in different ways because we're the

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

Unicameral and we're nonpartisan and I think we are unique. Senator Chambers says we're probably not going to vote on this. I don't know how many people are in the queue right now, and maybe there's somebody in the queue that would call the question. But next time I'm going to turn my light on and next time I'm going to see if we can move on because I think all we're doing is making this body less nonpartisan. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Johnson. Senator Kintner, you're recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR KINTNER: Well, thank you, Mr. President. Nobody enjoys a good political discussion as much as I do I guess. It's interesting to hear the things that I just heard. I would submit to Senator Johnson that the cloture vote will be the vote on this bill. If you support it, you would vote for cloture; if you oppose it, you would vote against cloture. And I understand why people would vote either way. I think I heard a couple of senators try to sell this as economic growth. (Laugh) We need to keep this electoral process in our state because it provides jobs and money in our state. Holy cow! I mean, I think I heard people try to sell Medicaid expansion as economic growth. I mean, I'm amazed at some of the things that I hear. Either it's good public policy or it's not. We are not going to sell more radio ads or TV time because the Presidential campaign spends money here. We will be sold out. There's only so much time. If there's no Presidential campaign spending money here, we're still going to sell out between the Governor's race, the Senate races, and all the other races. So, no, it doesn't add more money. I almost laugh when I hear that this is about economic growth. But, you know, I enjoy listening to Senator Avery. I actually learn some stuff from him from time to time, and I like to ask Professor Avery if he would submit to a question or two. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Senator Avery, will you yield? [LB382]

SENATOR AVERY: Yes, I will. [LB382]

SENATOR KINTNER: Professor Avery, if I may call you that because you're always teaching us stuff, you know, you said something to me personally which I thought was kind of interesting. You talked about the consequences if what the Democrats in this body are supporting. If we went to district in every state, what are the consequences nationally of doing that? Could you speak on that a little bit? [LB382]

SENATOR AVERY: Well, I've done some calculations based on the 2008 election. And in the case of California which has 55 electoral votes, Obama would have lost 11 in that state alone. Because all blue states have some red districts, all red states have some blue districts, and if you start dividing them based upon the...how the candidates do in each district, then it has consequences. I think that Obama would have lost 30 electoral votes in 2008. He would have still won, but he would not have won with the majority that

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

he had. [LB382]

SENATOR KINTNER: Thank you, Professor Avery. Thank you very much. So if you carry this through to its logical conclusion, just think if we had district-by-district elections in Ohio and Pennsylvania and Florida. You know, we might want to just pass this bill to protect the Democrat Party from themselves because if this catches on I think it would be pretty good for the Republican Party. As a matter of fact, there are Republicans in other states, Pennsylvania specifically, that want to go to district elections because in that instance it benefits them. So, you know, you got to be careful what you wish for sometimes. It doesn't always work out the way you think. Thank you, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Kintner. Senator Schumacher, you are recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. Senator Kintner pointed out a political reality. The idea of the way Nebraska does it in the early 1990s was maybe something that favored the Democrat. But thinking Republicans now know that the way Nebraska does it is in the words of a national commentator and of many key national Republican strategists the nuclear option. I am really surprised that my Democrat colleagues in this body are not getting e-mails from the DNC or Democrat strategist saying, my god, do you realize what these Republicans in the Legislature are about to do? They're about to kill the one thing that has had us laying awake nights shivering. The Nebraska way, 20 years ahead of its time, if it goes and is adopted in states like Wisconsin with 10 electoral votes, Michigan with 16 electoral votes--and these are 2011 figures--Pennsylvania with 20 electoral votes, all those states have GOP control of both houses of their legislature and their governor. They could make a switch. Those are the kind of electoral numbers, not one measly electoral number in Nebraska, but those are the kind of electoral numbers on that alone, 46. If you split those, that might make a difference in an election. For god's sake, kill this bill and you know what? The Democrats go to bed a little bit easier tonight and sleep. This is kind of...there was a panic in the Republican Party when they passed this--you're not a Republican if you don't support this in 2011. There was a belief that it would be a one electoral vote election and Omaha would go for Obama. And it was a panic vote. When you think about it, what is the best thing? Let's pretend we're partisan now. What is the best thing for the Republican Party nationally? Is it to run from the nuclear option and disarm this option? Or is it to keep the fire going in Pennsylvania, in Wisconsin, in Michigan? Is this body the tail of the dog, Republicans in this body, or the head of the dog? Or should we not be talking partisan politics at all here? Should this madness go away? Those are questions before this body, if we're the thinking members of this body, before the thinking Democrats of this body and Republicans of this body. What is good for Nebraska here? What do the latest polls on this issue show? The latest one I've seen seemed to indicate that an overwhelming majority of Nebraskans want to leave things

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

the way they are. I'm not sure. That poll was taken a couple years ago. Maybe things have changed. Maybe the fires of partisanship have increased in the state. But these are things that worthy to discuss here, worthy to think about. And this is not an open-and-shut case if you're a loyal Republican. Some strategists think the Democrats in this body are making a terrible mistake by fighting this. Thank you. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Schumacher. Senator Ashford, you're recognized, and this is your third time. [LB382]

SENATOR ASHFORD: Thank you, Mr. President. That was a wonderful discussion between my friend Senator Kintner and Senator Schumacher because it is a great discussion. I read a...there was an excellent article, I think it was in New York Times this weekend about Rand Paul, and when I look at Senator Kintner and I look at Rand Paul I see the same person. And the beauty of that is that that's what makes us a great place, is that you can come here and you can espouse certain values that have maybe just sort of beginning to creep into the national dialogue, maybe more now than before, and you can get up and you can espouse those views independently. You can be a party member, but when you espouse those views in this body you're doing it independently. I think when it comes right down to it, and I don't...Senator Johnson is right, I mean, we come here to vote. I hate filibusters. I don't think this really is one, but I mean I...because I think it's a great discussion. But I think Senator Johnson's comments, you have seminal moments. I saw Senator Schmit out behind the glass and I remember when he changed to becoming against the death penalty. I remember that very well. When I always see Senator Schmit, when I see Loran, I always remind him of when he made that switch from saying why do we have the death penalty. There's always an opportunity that we could be executing the wrong person, and there's an unfairness in the system when the ultimate penalty is assessed. We can disagree on that issue, but I remember when Senator Schmit made that decision or made that change. I think that Senator Johnson made a very seminal point last year on Medicaid, and I think it was somewhat of a historic statement because it needs to be said. When we have tough issues, when we have tough issues like Medicaid or whatever it is, I mean, we're going to go home, our lives are going to go on, but we're going to believe what we believe. But what is critical is that we had that statement by Senator Johnson which I absolutely was a heartfelt statement in my view, and we set those markers. Hey, time out. Time out. Let's vote on Medicaid. Because you know what? There are 50,000 people in this state that don't have insurance. Now maybe they could get it or maybe they could go to the emergency room, but it's a valid point and it needs to be debated and discussed and voted on. I think this vote is so far beyond what party somebody is in, because Senator Schumacher is absolutely right. Pennsylvania, Republicans have tried...I think Senator Kintner maybe mentioned this, have tried and tried and tried to get this same Maine-Nebraska system so that they could be a predictable Republican state in Presidential elections. This is not a vote about that in my view. For me, it's a vote about the independent nature of our body. And it's the independent...I'm proud to be a

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

Nebraskan because I think we are, as I said, by nature independent. So when I vote or things like this and when I voted for that bill in 1994, or whenever it was, I thought I want to be different. I want to be just like Maine, but like nobody else. You know, Maine is a bunch of rocks and ocean, you know. I want to be just like Maine, but I want to be different. I want to be independent. I want to give our voters a chance. In my city in Omaha, I don't care who they vote for, but I want to get them out there working. When I ran for mayor, which is neither here nor there, I'm still here, but when I... (laugh) I'm happy to be here. I'm proud to be here. I think the voter turnout was 18 percent, I mean, that's...come on. Come on! We have to do whatever we can do to get people to vote... [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

SENATOR ASHFORD: ...to encourage them to participate, to encourage them to be part of the process, so that special interests aren't controlling the outcome. The reason we do that in Omaha is so a very small number of voters can vote and elect whoever that person...for mayor or city council. We like that control from outside interests apparently. This for me is a vote on independence--the independence of our state, the independence of our body. I could care less about the political ramifications of the decision. Thank you, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Ashford. Still wishing to speak: Senator Murante, Chambers, and Johnson. Senator Murante, you're recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR MURANTE: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Legislature. I'm still in support of LB382. In light of what Senator Ashford said regarding voter turnout in the Omaha elections, I think it's a reasonable point. I believe it's a natural consequence of a municipality having an election system that is outside the normal gubernatorial or Presidential election process, and I think that's a discussion that we really ought to have as to why the city Omaha, and for that matter the city of Lincoln, are having off-year elections which inherently have lower voter turnout and cost the counties hundreds of thousands of dollars. But that's a different discussion for a different day. This bill, and there's been a lot of talk about the political parties today. I have a somewhat unique perspective in that Senator Avery, myself, Senator Lautenbaugh, and Senator Mello have worked for the past year on a bill that I introduced that's currently sitting in the Government Committee which deals exclusively with political parties. Although it deals with political parties, I would not call the bill particularly partisan. In fact, both sides have attempted to reach out to both political parties because there is much reform that is needed in Article 7 of the Election Act that pertains to how this state regulates political parties, particularly how those states nominate candidates for President of the United States. And it's been an interesting process, but it's been a process that I think kind of illustrates what's been talked about today on this floor and yesterday that for the most part, while this bill may break some people down on partisan lines, I think for the most

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

part the members of this Legislature try and pass legislation that they think is in the best interests of all people. And I appreciate the work on that bill that Senator Mello has brought to the table. We...at this point, there's not a lot of election bills that we have that have been cosponsored by Murante, Lautenbaugh, Mello, and Avery, but we got that accomplished at the very least. And the fundamental question that that bill is going to ask this Legislature is what can we do to make the elections in the state of Nebraska matter more. There's been a lot of discussion about that subject on the floor. And while we may disagree or agree on general elections and how to split up our electoral votes and what would make Nebraska most important, one thing that we cannot disagree with is that when it comes to Presidential primaries, the votes literally don't matter at all. The two political parties, it's the only race, the only office that we have on the ballot that the two political parties can completely disregard their own primary voters and elect whoever they see fit. A lot of us don't think that's the right approach to have. We're the only state in the Union that has an advisory primary which the establishments, the leaders of both political parties can just completely shrug off and nominate whoever they want to. So we're going to have a long discussion, I can tell you, later this year on how best to approach that. And there are 50 states in this country and every state does it a little bit differently. But I think we've developed an approach working in a bipartisan way that will work with both the Democrat Party and the Republican Party. Because if we don't do anything on that subject matter before this year ends... [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

SENATOR MURANTE: ...we are facing the practical reality, the state of Nebraska will have absolutely no voice in how our candidates for President from the respective political parties are nominated. We have to have action on this before the end of this year because if we wait till next year, the candidates will already be campaigning, the election will already be underway, and it will be very difficult to change an election process in the middle of the game. We all know how difficult it is to pass legislation changing the rules while you're in the middle of the game. And that's something that we have to do this year. So the members of the Government Committee, I think, are already fairly well briefed in how we're going down this road, but I would encourage the members of the Legislature, if you have any questions on this, please come to me and if you have any concerns because there are competing priorities in this piece of legislation, but we want to make sure that everyone's interests are taken care of and accounted for. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Time, Senator. [LB382]

SENATOR MURANTE: Thank you, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Murante. Senator Chambers, you're recognized, and this is your third time, sir. [LB382]

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, when a question is asked that has merit and it's left hanging without an answer, I like to try to supply an answer. And the question that was asked related to the public purpose of this bill, so is Senator Avery in the Chamber? I see him, I see him. Clearly there's a noble public purpose for this bill. Articulation of that public purpose is you're due. Republicans comprise the public. Grasp that if you will. Not Republican? Then public does not include you. You have to understand the context in which things happen. Those supporting this bill deem what is beneficial to the Republican Party to be everything. So if you're not a member of that party, you're not included in the definition of public. But since they have made Republican and the word "public" synonymous, whatever is good for the Republican Party is good for the public. Whatever is good for General Motors is good for America. Senator Johnson made some very good comments. And he is intending to act within the rules for which he voted. I voted against those rules and I made a great show of emphasizing it. But everything I do will be done within the rules. I don't play chess anymore, but it's a game where you try to think ahead for yourself and anticipate what you're opponent might do. So if you look on your gadget, you'll see that I have more than one amendment pending on this bill. And that was an anticipation of somebody calling the question early. So I came prepared. I'm ready. Plus, my good friend Senator Johnson, I only have to talk three hours for each day on this bill because we only go till noon. I've thought about this. I've planned for it. And I said in the beginning my intent is to see that this bill goes nowhere. I think it is so pernicious, it's outside the realm of rational consideration, in my opinion. Such being the case, I have an obligation to stop it, and I intend to do everything along that line that I can. So if the question is called, I get to close on my amendment and I don't even have to draft another amendment. All I have to do is make a reconsideration motion. And like that song "Henry the VIII," second verse, same as the first. And that's what I'm going to do. I still think despite what my intentions are, and I'm going to carry them out, the discussion is good. It gives people a chance to go on record. And when this transcript is viewed by anybody, those "anybodies" will be able to see what was stated by each senator, evaluate, judge, draw a conclusion. But it won't mean anything to those of us who are on this floor. The public at large is not deemed to have any power. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Political muscle is what politicians respect and fear and seek. So the opinion of one citizen ordinarily means nothing. I'm probably the only one in this Legislature who answers the telephone, if I get to it before Cindy does, who will take time to talk to people. And I get some nutty calls. I get some threatening calls. I get insulting calls. Senator Kintner is raising his hand, well, he deserves them. I'm talking about a man who (laugh) shouldn't get that kind of nonsense. But despite that, I will talk to people because that's what I view my role to be. If I don't have time, I let the person know it, but that they can call me back, and when I have the time I will talk. On this bill,

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

people should mind what they say. And my final comment since my time is up: Nebraska on this is not an outlier; Nebraska is a leader. Thank you, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Chambers. (Visitors introduced.) Senator Johnson, you're recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR JOHNSON: I do call the question. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: The question has been called. Do I see five hands? I do see five hands. The question is, shall debate cease? All those in favor vote aye; opposed, nay. Have all those voted that wish to? Please record, Mr. Clerk. [LB382]

ASSISTANT CLERK: 17 ayes, 6 nays to cease debate, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Debate does not cease. Returning to debate, Senator Crawford, you are recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Thank you, Mr. President. For the record, I, again, want to call us back to the question that is the question at hand in this body which is: What is best for Nebraska? We have the privilege of being in a federal system; it creates differences across the states and different election laws and this is one example where a state have an ability to make those choices. And our question in this body is what's best for Nebraska? Let me also remind everyone, for the record, about how this works in Nebraska. There have been a couple of mentions of the fear in national discussions about what would happen if all electoral votes were decided by Congressional districts. That does cause a question if all electoral votes in all of our states were all decided by Congressional districts, then the partisan gerrymandering that we have seen that caused more people to vote for Democratic candidates in the last Congressional race, but more Republicans to win seats would indeed distort the Presidential race. However, again, let's come back to what we are debating. We're talking about what we do in Nebraska. And let me remind our colleagues that that is our question, that's what we're supposed to ask. In Nebraska, actually, only three of our five votes are determined by Congressional districts. So we have a mixed system here. We have a system where some are decided by Congressional districts and some are decided at large. It's an interesting system. And that then provides some at-large voice and some Congressional district voice. So here in Nebraska we have the best of both. We have an at-large voice and we have an Congressional district voice. And I think that works well for Nebraska. We have seen that it increases attention to Nebraska; increases engagement in Nebraska; increases voting turnout in Nebraska; that it has absolutely been good for Nebraska. And if other states choose to look and decide what's best for their state, that's their prerogative. Our question is: What's best for Nebraska? Thank you. [LB382]

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Crawford. Senator Murante, you're recognized.
[LB382]

SENATOR MURANTE: Thank you, Mr. President and members. After my previous comments, I had an off-the-microphone conversation with Senator Nordquist, and so I thought, perhaps, it might be helpful to illustrate where the challenges we have right now as a state and as a country and the decisions and the choices that we have to make. I'll throw this out on the microphone right now, because it's a discussion that I'm going to have with everyone individually because it's a major policy shift. And the challenge we have right now is that both political parties, on a national level, have made the determination that they do not want to wait as long to have their national conventions. Instead of having their national conventions around Labor Day, they want to have them in the middle of summer in June. The problem with that is we have all sorts of statutes which states that our county conventions and our state conventions have to take place in June and July and unless we do something about it, we won't have a framework to elect delegations to the national convention by the time the national conventions actually occur, which leaves us with a couple of options. And the most drastic of the options, which is something that we're going to have to consider, is whether we want to move up our primary. That's a policy choice that we're going to have to make. We're going to talk about it in public hearing and it's something that I need guidance and the input from every member of this Legislature as to whether that's a route we want to go down. But as we stand right now, we are in jeopardy of not having a delegation at the national conventions to nominate a President of the United States and, therefore, the people of Nebraska will have absolutely no voice on that question. So that's where we're at. There is a question as to whether we should move the primary up to April. I would suggest that if we're having a conversation right now about how to make Nebraska's votes in November matter more, we ought to have that discussion about the primary as well as it's, perhaps, not equally as important, but it's very important. And right now our May primary is one of the last in the country and if we don't do anything about it, it's going to result in...without delegations in either political party. So those are the questions that we're going to have to face. And there are some difficult questions, whereas Senator Nordquist and I were discussing, both sides to the story in many instances. So those are the questions that we're going to have going forward. And I look forward to having that discussion with all of you. Thank you, Mr. President.
[LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Murante. Senator Bloomfield, you're recognized.
[LB382]

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: Thank you, Mr. President. Seeing how we're engaged in the age old art of killing time, I'd like to ask Senator Murante a question or two if I could.
[LB382]

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

SENATOR KRIST: Senator Murante, will you yield? [LB382]

SENATOR MURANTE: Cheerfully. [LB382]

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: Thank you, Senator Murante. You brought up the national parties here, so I assume you have some knowledge in that area. What if we were to move our primary to January 1 and jump ahead of Iowa and everybody else? Have the parties passed rules so that we can't do that? [LB382]

SENATOR MURANTE: They have. Both political parties and the Republican National Committee was the last one to vote would say, if we jump ahead of Iowa, who has to have their...who can now...they can't have their caucuses earlier than February. So if we were to move into January, the Republican Party would say: You just don't get a delegation; you can do it if you want to do it, but you don't get...you won't have any seats on the floor. And that would, sort of, defeat the purpose of doing that. [LB382]

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: As Senator Chambers pointed out, I am a Republican. But I think, maybe, it's time we start to tell our national party...both of our national parties that they don't run Nebraska, we do. If we want to set our primary in January, let's do it. If they don't want to count us, oh well. [LB382]

SENATOR MURANTE: You know, Senator Bloomfield, the interesting part of the research that we've come in is there's an odd relationship between the parties and the states on this subject matter. And at state law defers to the political parties and the rules of the political party defers to the state law so they understand that there is a relationship there and neither one of them really want to step on each other's toes, so that's the thrust of my bill is to try and make it uniform, but it's been a challenge, believe it. [LB382]

SENATOR BLOOMFIELD: I'm vaguely familiar with your bill, but I'm also very familiar with the idea that sometimes it's fun to step on toes. Thank you. [LB382]

SENATOR MURANTE: Thank you. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Bloomfield and Senator Murante. Senator Campbell, you're recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR CAMPBELL: Thank you, Mr. President. Colleagues, I've listened to some of the discussion on the bill. And I hadn't really planned to say a lot about it, and I probably won't speak very long. But a couple of perspectives have been going through my mind. And that is, for my colleagues that have been with me nearly the six years that we've been in the Legislature, you can well imagine that I have probably been on every watch list that the state Republican Party has put out because of my stands on certain issues.

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

And I have to tell you a story I remember distinctly from Senator Abbie Cornett when she and I appeared on a watch list, and I believe it had to do when we were discussing the prenatal bill. And she said to me: You know, Cathy, this is kind of a distinction, I've not only been on a Republican watch list, but I've also been on a Democratic watch list. And I thought that Senator Cornett had a pretty good perspective there. I belong to several organizations besides a political party: the Lincoln Independent Business Association, the Lincoln Chamber, you can go on and on. And I suppose those organizations, like a political party, could say we really want our members to do such. So I think we have to keep in perspective here what the political parties are saying. And I have found over the last five years, going on six, that such lists from a political party affect far more the people in those political parties who support the people, the senators, on that watch list. People who supported me through all the years I've been in political office, they were the people who got upset with the list. They were the people who said: By golly, I'm not going to give them any more money. I think the parties need to be careful with those, because I am a Republican. A lot of people probably don't know, I'm a third-generation Republican officeholder. I've stayed in the Republican Party for a number of reasons, but that's not the issue today. But I just want to temper some of the comments by saying sometimes you have to be careful because you don't know putting out such lists who really takes all of that to heart. I'm one who feels that the issue before us is really three things. This is an issue, I think, that we pay attention to what our constituents tell us. And I've had a number of letters on both sides of this: support it or oppose it. But their thoughtful remarks, I think, do frame and help each one of us in our vote. I agree with Senator Janssen that this issue is one that we vote on, not because I believe of a political party, but your own philosophy and how you view the structure of the electorate and the importance to the people. And the third is really to ensure that through the discussion we protect the Unicameral and the system we all have come to respect and uphold and fight for and hope that the discussion does not lapse into hurting what we truly believe is a great institution. Thank you, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Campbell. Seeing no one else in the queue, Senator Chambers, you're recognized to close on your amendment. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, Senator Campbell, a lot of times when I disembark, Senator Bloomfield, people think that it's a ship going nowhere. But see, I know how people behave. I know that if a subject is before us long enough, and people know it's going to be here long enough, and they're thoughtful, they will be drawn into the net as was Senator Campbell, who has acknowledged that she wasn't thinking initially she would have anything to say on this. There has been some very good discussion. There are opinions expressed with which I disagree. In a group like a legislature, much debating occurs, differing opinions when expressed help focus on and sharpen the issue. Sometimes people do not accord their own words the weight that some were listening will accord those words. I have said

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

in the beginning I'm going to make sure this bill does not come to a vote and I have to show that I can deliver when I say that. This is just practice. This is preparation. I will not be worn out. And I don't make that declaration on every bill with which I disagree, at least I don't make it at the outset. It's not always my intention to deal with a bill in that fashion. But sometimes, depending on the direction of the discussion and where the Legislature seems to be going, I have to alter my course and I adjust and adapt. Senator Johnson mentioned that he was identified as a Democrat. When national media do articles on me, and believe it or not, they do, they pay attention to what I say and they wonder somebody in Nebraska could say the things that I say and they'll ask me and I say, well, I can read. I read history. I didn't live during those periods of time. But I read and I understand what I read so I can express these ideas even though I live in Nebraska. Then I also point out when they ask me why I stay here, I tell them all my family is here and all of my friends, both of them. So I'll be here for a while, unless one of those dies, then I'll just stay here out of meanness and knowing how my mere presence upsets so many Nebraskans. It gives a lot of business to those who sell antacid tablets. I've been described as a Democrat because there seems to be a general notion that people who express certain views must be a Democrat. I register Independent. There are things on some of these...they call them social media, that say I graduated from Central High School. I did not graduate from Central High School. Some people have the view, if they've read anything about Central, that it's very academic, and if anybody...especially a black guy, can put two sentences together and make sense, he had to graduate from Central. I deliberately did not go to Central. My brothers and sisters, older than I am, all went to Central. I deliberately chose to go to Tech. Technical High School was what it was called. It was deemed to be a school of a lesser order, of lesser worth... [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...and people who went there were not able to cut the mustard at another school. But I went there anyway because I wanted to walk the trail less traveled, and in this case, not traveled at all by my brothers and sisters. They say that I graduated in some instances in 1954 because they want to make it coincide with the handing down of the decision Brown v. Board of Education which outlawed segregation in the public schools. I graduated in 1955 from Tech. I graduated in 1959 from Creighton. A lot of people draw conclusions that are not valid, some accustomed to being mislabeled, and that will be the case here. But I'm going to kill this bill one way or the other. And by kill, I mean it's not going to come to a vote. Thank you, Mr. President. And I would ask for a call of the house. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: There's been a request to place the house under call. The question is, shall the house go under call? All those in favor vote aye; opposed, nay. Please record, Mr. Clerk. [LB382]

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

ASSISTANT CLERK: 27 ayes, 0 nays to go under call, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. Those unexcused senators outside the Chamber please return to the Chamber and record your presence. All unauthorized personnel please leave the floor. The house is under call. Senator McGill, Senator Burke Harr, Senator Lathrop, Senator Pirsch, Senator Karpisek, Senator Ashford, Senator Brasch, Senator Davis, please return to the Chamber, the house is under call. Senator McGill, Senator Ashford, Senator Davis, please return the Chamber, the house is under call. Senator Davis, please return to the Chamber, the house is under call. Senator Chambers, everyone is accounted for. How would you like to proceed? [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Roll call vote. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Mr. Clerk, there has been a request for a roll call vote. [LB382]

ASSISTANT CLERK: (Roll call vote taken, Legislative Journal page 394.) 8 ayes, 22 nays, Mr. President, on the adoption of the amendment. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: The amendment fails. Raise the call. Items for the record please, Mr. Clerk. [LB382]

ASSISTANT CLERK: Thank you, Mr. President. New resolution, LR427 by Senator Carlson. Accompanying that resolution, a communication from the Speaker referring LR427 to the Reference Committee. Your Committee on General Affairs reports LB680 to General File; Transportation reports LB757, LB758, LB776, and LB777 all to General File, some with committee amendments. Have notice of committee hearing from Judiciary Committee, Revenue Committee, Natural Resources Committee; a confirmation report from Transportation and Telecommunications. Amendments to be printed: Senator Mello to LB371; and Senator Ashford to LB464. (Also, an amendment by Senator Mello to LB56, Legislative Journal pages 395-403.) [LR427 LB680 LB757 LB758 LB776 LB777 LB371 LB464 LB56]

Returning to LB382. I have a priority motion, Senator Chambers would move to reconsider the vote just taken on FA178. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Senator Chambers, you're recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the Legislature, I have talked to Senator Johnson. When he stood up earlier and made his comments about not getting a chance to vote on bills and so forth and I went down and I talked to him. I said, philosophically, I would agree with what he said. But that is not the way things happen here. And I told him that if he is going to call the question on every motion that I put up

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

there, I'll just write more motions. I will not be silenced. I cannot be silenced. So you can call the question on every motion, but I also told him that I'll just offer reconsideration motion. We are talking about a lot of things other than the exact subject that Senator Janssen is bringing to us in his bill. But his bill is so pernicious, it is so narrow in its scope, so unjustified in its purpose, so unworthy of a democratic process that I have to oppose it and I'm going to. We're going to talk on any issue that is before us and say what we would say no matter what the particular motion or amendment might be. But I think some of you may have voted against my amendment because I did not go into any detail about what it does. So let me read from the bill the language that is in the law itself. And I'm just going to read the first sentence which will be affected by my amendment. The law right now says on page 2, beginning in line 3, "Each political party shall hold a state postprimary convention biennially on a date to be fixed by the state central committee." Digressing, when I saw "central committee," I thought we were setting up a Communist cell around here. But since we're not back there in the '50s it means something other than a Commie plot..."by the state central committee but not later than September 1." What I have done with...oh, I have to read the second sentence, "Candidates for elective offices may be nominated at such conventions pursuant to," and it gives a statutory citation. My amendment strikes the two words "Each political" and it says instead: "The Republican Party." Since this is a one-party state, we may as well be honest and let people know that this is like the parties in those countries that are roundly condemned by the self-righteous, hypocritical people in America who says democracy is what you want. This, in effect, is a one-party state. And Senator Janssen's bill is simply trying to make the processes conform to that one-party state structure. But I want to be honest. So here's what that language would say with my amendment: "The Republican Party shall hold a state postprimary convention biennially on a date to be fixed by the state central committee but not later than September 1. Candidates for elective offices may be nominated at such convention." Since there's only one party, there should only be one convention so I strike that plural word "conventions" and substitute the word "convention." We're talking about the political party known by the designation "Republican." Some people call it the GOP, the Grand Old Party. I don't know if that means everybody's in it is old or that everything they do is outdated and outmoded. Since they have the word "old" in it, I think of it as an old gray mare. And the old gray mare, she ain't what she used to be. And you know why mare is such an appropriate designation, even though they use an elephant? Leave the "ephelant" out of it. The "Repelican" Party is the party of "no", n-o, negative, objecting "grumbletonians, but to keep with my imagery of that tired, dilapidated party, as the old gray mare; I would call it the "party of neigh," n-e-i-g-h. And that has a double meaning--the sound of an old gray mare and also the negative word "no." That's what the "Repelican" Party is. And they walk in lockstep. I wish Senator Bloomfield hadn't come in here and dressed the way he is today, but had worn his undertaker's suit like he does sometime, then I could say they all dress alike. Look at them. Senator Janssen over there trying to hide his face. I don't blame him. Senator McCoy, thinking by being quiet he can blend into the background and I won't notice him, that calls him more to my

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

attention. In fact, he has been so quiet, and I disagree with so much that he says when he speaks, he ought to run for Governor more often. And I might put something into the statute, if I can get it, where a member of the Legislature can run for Governor once every year. Look at our new member, "General" Garrett. "General," I give people promotions when they're entitled to them and since you've been under the tutelage of Senator Kintner, you have progressed backward quicker than most people do, so you're a colonel when you come, but now you're a general. Who else? There's my good friend, Senator Wightman. But he dressed that way not just because he's a "Repelican", he is entitled to. He is scholarly. The only reason I won't apply the term "emeritus" to him as a lawyer is because he is still operating as a lawyer, I believe. Senator Nelson, but he sits so close to me that when he stands up, if he has a cup of hot coffee, he could accidentally on purpose lunge forward, splash that coffee all over me. So I'm going to go gently on Senator Nelson. But from what I've said, you understand the "par-tea" of which he is a part. Now, Senator Hansen was here when there were only three people whose last name ended with the sound "son," and I refer to them as "my three sons." But now Senator Larson came here and messed it up. You know how things go, I think Senator Hansen knows me so well he figured I was going to do something like this so he deliberately dressed differently from the way that the other "Repelicans" do. They think I don't notice things. I notice things about all my colleagues. And when I look across the aisle, the song that comes to my mind: (singing) "the lady in red, the fellows are crazy about the lady in red." Look around. Do you all remember that song that the guys they call the Jersey Boys sang? Frankie Valli and the Four Seasons? They sing about Sherry, but I'm not going to sing it, Sherry, Sherry baby. And then he says...well, I see Senator..the lady in the red dress, her complexion is becoming closer and closer to that of her dress. (Laughter) But the guy talks about: with her red dress on, moving nice and easy, girl you make me lose my mind. That's in the song. I'm just giving the lyrics. And I may as well do this, this morning. People have gotten a bit lethargic. The subject we are discussing is very serious. But even serious subjects can be discussed in a lighthearted way. On the subject of lightheartedness, when you watch a comedian who is very good and plays the role of a dumb female... [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...it takes intelligence to do that. And the one who did it better than anybody I ever saw was Gracie Allen, the wife of George Burns, who I don't think he died, I think he just was transfigured because...that means you go away, but you don't die. He played God in a movie. But then God objected because he said: I don't want anybody older than myself playing me. So George had to stop doing that. As we proceed with this bill, there are going to be serious matters discussed. But I'm going to say just whatever it is I feel like because the constitution allows me to do that, and even if it didn't, I would do it anyway. Thank you, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Johnson, you are

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR JOHNSON: I'm going to make a couple explanation of some comments I made earlier. First of all, I kept my word on the question. As I've been involved with groups in meetings and talking engagements, right now, people are not asking me about property tax and income tax; they're not talking about the good time. They're talking about school aid. They're talking about how we're going to be able to move forward and get the important things done...that needs to be done in this Legislature. I offered that, partly, I knew Senator Chambers has more amendments. I offered that partly to explain to some of those people that are asking me those questions, here's how the rules work. And here's how you can try something and whether you move forward. I could have called for the house. I knew that was not going to be beneficial in the long-run. So I took the defeat, but I got my point out, I think, to some of those people as they're starting to learn the rules as they watch us on TV. Another clarification that doesn't have anything to do with what we're talking about today, except Senator Chambers brought up the old gray mare, when I first got in the Legislature, I had an article written by the Legislative Journal, I forget the name...what we call it, but it was written on the name on my license plate on my pickup. License plate on my pickup indicates "old gray mayor" not "old gray mare." And I had written a song talking about the "old gray mayor," changing the words, but I will not sing that today. You might ask why I voted "aye" on the vote. I really don't support that amendment. I thought it, probably, if it did pass, I was pretty sure it wouldn't, but it would, to me, make the bill worse and we would be able to, maybe, go to a vote and kill the bill. And if we do get to a vote on LB382, I will vote against it. I think it is just a divisive situation. It's good discussion, but I don't think we need to continue a lot more discussion on it. Thank you. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Johnson. Senator Chambers, you're recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President. And Senator Johnson speaks learnedly and well and he's correct. But I also have made a declaration and I'm going to carry it out. Before I say something like that, that I'm going to do all I can to stop this bill, I think about it and I determine that it's the only thing that I can do. I would never be able to persuade enough people not to vote for this bill and it is pernicious. It is something that, in my opinion, would degrade the Legislature, degrade the legislative process, degrade the state. The "Repelicans" want everything. They win the statewide offices. They're a majority in the Legislature. They got the Governor. They got the Auditor. They got the Secretary of State. They got the Attorney General. They want everything, so they have to know that there will be one person at least who will tell them I'm going to be like the beach today. And I'll say to the ocean, this far shall you come and no farther. And that's where we are; that's where I am on this bill. And when I say I will do it, I'm prepared to do it. Even if we were not going to go only till noon, when I say I will go from

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

early in the morning until midnight, I mean it. The only thing about there being new people here, you've not seen me do it. But the ones who were here before you all came had seen...they had seen me do it. And when around 6:00 they get tired or get in their cups, they go in that lounge and put their feet up and go to sleep, and I'd still be out there on the floor carrying the ball myself because I'm the one who sees the necessity and feels the obligation to do it. I don't say that people see the world through the same eyes that I see it. I cannot put my responsibilities that I feel on them and say they should feel the same way. The desires of their heart are not the desires of mine, if I had a heart. So each of us does what we think we ought to do. If it's following along like a lemming, that's what you think you ought to do, so you do it. But in the same way that you think you have the right to do what you feel you should do, I will seize the right and do what I think I ought to do. And I'll do it and that's what I'm doing. You ought to be happy to have somebody in your midst who, when he gives his word, you know that that means what he says. And he's not going to say one thing to you to your face and then something to somebody else behind your back. You will know what I think. And if you want to know and I haven't told you, ask me. I will not curse you out. Such language is beneath me. Fowl things don't come out of me. You know why? Of the abundance of the heart, the mouth speaketh. Since I have no heart, there's nothing that comes out of a heart, it has to come out of my head. And my head is where my brains reside and my brains think. So I'm aware of what I say. You all may act on the basis of what your heart or your emotions tell you. Consequently, you say things you don't mean. You say things without thinking. You say things you wish you had not said. But I know what I'm saying. However, what I say at a given moment may not accord with the facts of the situation. But it's what I believe at that moment. But when evidence comes that shows me the position that I took is inaccurate, I change to accord with the facts. There's nothing for me to gain... [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...by knowingly holding to a position that I know is false. So I made my colleagues a promise and my colleagues expect me to carry it out. And my colleagues would be disappointed if I did not carry it out. The wind blows where it "listeth." That's what's in the "Bibble." Now I don't have any idea what that means, but I have an idea of what it's trying to convey. And that's all language is designed to do--to carry to your mind what is in my mind. And maybe some of us around here will say: isn't, aren't, but one person uses the utility word "ain't" which is singular, plural, first person, second person, third person... [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Time, Senator. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...yet because it's so good, people deny it. Thank you. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Schumacher, you're

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. I believe Senator Chambers when he says we're going to go eight hours and maybe more on this. So let's take advantage of that time and reflect upon a real problem in our political system in this state. I know it's a problem with the Republican Party and I presume that it's a problem with the Democrat Party. And if I'm wrong on that, I'm sure someone will correct me. Our parties were supposed to be grass-root parties. And the fundamental unit of how the party organization works is there are things called county conventions. And the way it was supposed to work, and maybe did years and years and years and years ago, was the party members of each political party got together sometime in May or June and they discussed party ideas and they discussed platforms and they brought forth local political ideas of the party and they made recommendations to the state levels of the parties. And years and years and years ago those were probably well attended. Maybe that's because there was...before something better to watch on television. But what we've seen in recent times is that those political party conventions at the county level have become dismal jokes. Less than 1 percent of the voting members of a party show up at those things. In order to participate in a county convention, you're supposed to, in the same time frame as filing for office, file for election to the county convention. And there are certain numbers of delegates to the county conventions that are available. And as a practical matter, those limits are never, never, ever met because very few people file. So you maybe get in a county of 30,000, 20 people filing to show up. Now it's gotten more complicated, at least in the Republican Party in recent years, because it used to be that those 20 people, when they showed up at that convention, passed a motion saying: Any other good Republicans that happen to show up here, or even bad Republicans, you can be part of our convention; this is about democracy. Well, in recent years there has been a phenomena in which the people who registered for the convention decide not to open up those conventions, in fact, to exclude more people. So that only a very, very, very tiny number of people are involved at the county level. And folks out there in listening land, if anybody is listening, if you're a Republican or a Democrat and you think that the party mechanism is worth saving, you think that the party mechanisms are broke, go down to the local election commissioner, sign up as a delegate to your party convention if they're worthwhile in reviving. But anyway, at this party convention at the local level that they have, they do things like choose a local party platform, vent ideas, drink some coffee, eat some cake, and they also elect the delegates to the state convention. And those are usually allocated by how strong the local party performed in the last Presidential election or gubernatorial election, can't quite remember which. But...and then they send them off to the state convention. The state conventions usually are well-orchestrated events designed principally to keep down any descent and make everybody look happy. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: And they usually adopt a type of political platform which tries to say as little in as many words as possible and tries to gender some type of a support. That particular state convention then elects the state central committees. And since we're going to have plenty of time to continue this little lecture at some point in the future today, I'll stop there so I don't bring in chapter 2 before chapter 3. Thank you. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Schumacher. Those still wishing to speak: Senator Karpisek, Senator Ken Haar, and Senator Chambers. Senator Karpisek, you're recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR KARPISEK: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. Senator Chambers often brings up that some people don't think that he'll be able to do eight hours or that he'll do what he says that he'll do. I've never had a doubt that he would do what he said that he would do. Many times I wished that he wouldn't do what he said he would do, but he always does. I think my first year here, he took us until 11:45 or something one night. And I did not doubt that he could do it, but he proved it. And again, I just walked away thinking well that was kind of futile because I knew he could, but at least we all knew. But again, no surprise. I really appreciate that he does do what he says he's going to do. And again, not even that I like what he does all the time. I do appreciate the honesty in here most of the time. Senator Johnson talked about why he did what he did and how he's tried to stay nonpartisan. And Senator Johnson has been on the General Affairs Committee since he's been here. And I want to say that what he has done and tried to do has not gone unnoticed. He's been a great member of that committee and a great member of this body, even though we don't maybe always see eye to eye on every issue. That's okay. He votes how he feels is right, he listens, and we can get on with what we do. I don't like it when we have some gamesmanship that happens. Someone says they'll do something, maybe to get you off a filibuster, but no more than after you get off the filibuster, you walk downstairs and then it's, oh, sorry, I can't do anything about it. That happened to me once. I was dumb enough to believe it; never again. And when that happens, a whole lot of trust is lost. I know this is an important issue for a lot of people for different reasons. My whole reason is that I think if that small part of Omaha wants to vote differently, then they should. We are a very diverse state, but I think we all come together as Nebraskans and we always hear of the "Nebraska way." But that always works for when we want it our way as the Nebraska way. We talk about that not every...what if every state did this? We're not doing anything for any other state; this is our state. I think they should do it the way we do it. But I'm sure, just like I don't care what they think, they don't care what I think in California or anywhere else. It's good to look at other states and see how they do things. Why reinvent the wheel? If something is working for them, we should look at it, but that doesn't mean we follow them. If that was the case, we wouldn't be a one-house Legislature, which again I want to say I feel is, for the most part, very nonpartisan.

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

[LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

SENATOR KARPISEK: Others may not think that, but I think that's because the way they work in here. They see everything as partisan. I don't see many things partisan. I try not to. I don't think that people want us to be partisan unless they're really on one end or the other and on a couple different issues it does get that way. For the most part it isn't. I think if one part of Omaha can cast a vote different, the rest of the state different than them, we should let it stay that way. Thank you, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Karpisek. Senator Ken Haar, you are recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR HAAR: Mr. President, members of the body, it should surprise none of us that this, over the years, has been a partisan issue. And it's probably an indication I save too much paper, but there was an article by Don Walton in the Lincoln Journal Star, January 8, 2011, titled "GOP prioritizes electoral vote change." And I'd just like to read that article, gives, again, some background. Omaha--The Nebraska Republican Party mounted an all-out assault Saturday on the state's divided Presidential electoral vote system, vowing to fight for a return to winner-take-all for the candidates who prevails statewide. GOP State Chairman Mark said the party intends to "hold our Republican state senators accountable,"...so listen up,...for those votes on a legislative bill that would wipe out the current system of awarding one electoral vote to the winner of each of the state's three Congressional districts and the remaining two electoral votes to the statewide winner. And that was a quote. "Thirty-four of the forty-nine senators in the nonpartisan Legislature are registered Republicans." That's a little different today, but. "Packets of information supporting the electoral vote bill, LB21, were distributed to members of the GOP state central committee after their unanimous approval of a resolution endorsing the change. Included in the packet was a sample letter that constituents can mail to their state senator urging enactment of the legislation. Senator Beau McCoy of Omaha, sponsor of the bill, told committee members that winner-take-all should be viewed more as an expression of, quote, Nebraska unity, end quote. Republicans have attempted to repeal the split-vote system before, but the effort acquired a sense of urgency this year...remember, this is right before the last Presidential election, after Barack Obama won metropolitan Omaha's Second District vote in 2008, denying Republican nominee John McCain one of Nebraska's five electoral votes. The electoral vote issue headed the list of legislative priorities identified immediately after the party chair's reelection as party chairman by acclamation. "We would not want to see Obama's reelection in 2012 by one electoral vote in Omaha," McCoy warned. Twice in the past, the Legislature passed legislation to return to the winner-take-all system, but both times those bills were vetoed by Democratic Governor Ben Nelson. Nebraska and Maine are the only two states that split their electoral vote.

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

Nelson is, quote, priority numero uno, end quote, for Republicans, said, after looking ahead to 2012 when the Democratic senator faces reelection. And then to end, since I have a little bit more time this time at the mike, this is also from Don Walton's January 31 Nebraska polling story: Given the choice of three Presidential electoral votes allocation alternatives, most of the 977 Nebraska voters surveyed by telephone last week favored awarding those votes to the winner of the national popular vote. And here is a breakdown, and this was done January 26, 27, of 2011, by Public Policy Polling... [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

SENATOR HAAR: Thank you...for national popular vote. So it's a scientific...scientifically accurate, 57 percent favor the national popular vote winner; 27 supported allocation of electoral votes by Congressional district; 16 percent favored a winner-take-all system for awarding all electoral votes to Nebraska statewide. So really, it's a very small slice of Nebraskans, once they have the information, wanting to go back to winner take all. Really what we're aiming for is national popular vote. And as Senator Kintner promised earlier in one of his times at the mike, he will save the Democratic Party. I think that's what he said. So I'm hopeful. Thank you so much. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Haar. Senator Chambers, you're recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, not to embarrass my seatmate, Brother Schumacher, he rose to the level of the title that I bestowed on him which is "professor." There are a lot of things in this society which people take for granted. But they never analyze, they never really understand, they never question them, they're just there so no thought is given to them. "Professor" Schumacher is explaining the inner workings of these conventions systems how they impact overall on elections; how few people make certain decisions that are going to carry far more weight than they ought to. I don't believe all of this material in the statutes about the political parties should be in the statute. What I am amending will never be adopted. I wrote it in such a way that it would not be adopted. I wanted to focus on the fact that you have a one-party state in reality. In these countries where supposedly a dictator rules, the American hypocrites will say, well, it was a rigged election; you don't let these vote, you don't let that vote. And then Senator Janssen is bringing his bill says, well, we can keep some people...he doesn't say this, this is what it amounts to...we can keep certain people from voting if we require voter identification: the elderly, Latinos, black people. So they do it a different way, but it is the same thing. They don't want people to vote. And there are certain people they don't want to vote. And that's hypocritical. There's one notorious tyrant, dictator, condemned by Americans, an ambassador, about how many rights...human rights are abridged by that dictator. And the dictator didn't even argue. He said, let's let it be just like you said, but I'm not as bad

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

as you. You deprive people of rights in your country, but you also have the stain and burden of hypocrisy. You pretend that these things you wrote in your constitution mean something. You pretend there's no discrimination. You pretend that you have a melting pot in your country, but you don't. Pick up the newspaper. Why just the other day Madonna, that star whom some people love, put the...a variation of the "N" word on her social media site and thought it was all right...a white woman in America. Then I see all these hypocrites talking about Mr. Putin in Russia being homophobic because he doesn't want to grant rights to gay people, and I can't get a bill to protect the rights of gay and lesbian people through this Nebraska Legislature which Mr. McCoy said, in front of a committee, is a Christian state. Why would I want to be a Christian when one of the main tenets is discrimination. He said this country is built on Christianity. If he had read history, he would know that that's not true. But who reads history? And when you talk to people who don't know anything, you don't have to know anything and you can make all kind of grandiose, false statements. And the reason I bring it up, he said it at a committee hearing, it's on the record. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: He needs to read some things. You know what Thomas Jefferson did? He took a Christian Bible and he...they call it the Thomas Jefferson Bible, he cut out every miracle, every reference to supernatural, every son of God reference. And he said, you still have an outstanding moral guide. He wasn't a Christian. You know what the general term is to designate the supposed religious leanings or slants of those people? Agnostics and deists. The Christians were the slaveholders, that's what they were. So, when you've got this one-party state, isn't that what you say about Russia? Isn't that what they say about what they used to call Red China, other countries they didn't like? [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Time, Senator. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Schumacher, you are recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. Continuing on where I left off last time, let's do a brief review, political parties in the state are supposed to have as their core engine the county convention and the county committee. As a practical matter over time, the attendance at the county conventions has fallen off to probably well less than 1 percent, in some cases near zero. That's much to the frustration of both political parties and people that think the political parties are still viable entities in some form in modern society. At that convention, people try to develop policy--pretty hard to develop policy when you got three or four people at the

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

whole convention--and form a little platform that they might suggest up the ladder to the state level. And they elect local county officers who most of the time don't ever meet again until the next convention two years later. And they also elect delegates to the state convention, the number of which are determined by the county parties' performance in the prior gubernatorial/Presidential election. The state convention convenes largely as a ceremonial thing with some speeches, some applauding, some eating, some drinking, and, basically, passing a platform which tries not to offend anybody too much and tries to say a lot of nothing in a lot of words. At that convention, members of the state central committee are selected. And that committee...don't remember exactly how much it is on the Republican side, but 300 or 400 people, I think, are members of the central committee that come from across the state. That central committee then is supposed to meet quarterly. As a practical matter, what's happened, at least in one party, I presume something similar has happened in the other party, it's really not much accomplished. And so I think they're meeting now three times a year. Those meetings are, again, of very little substance most of the time. There are some caucuses which are the Congressional caucuses and general discussion and they're pretty good discussions because most of the people travel in there...most the time they're in Omaha or Lincoln, to do a little shopping, maybe go to a football game, and talk a little politics and hopefully get out by 12:30 or so, so they can do whatever they really planned to do that day. But the caucus discussion, maybe an hour or so, and some issues are decided...not decided, but discussed and a little talk goes on. At time I remember a Republican Central Committee Caucus of the Third District in which we discussed whether we thought our Congressmen's toilet paper was rolled one way or rolled the other way. And that's the honest-to-God truth. But at any rate, it's a nice little discussion and then there is a well-orchestrated central committee meeting which is done, certain items of business which are usually preprogramed and pretty much cut and dried affair, even though once in a while somebody actually thinks something should be accomplished at those meetings. Usually they meet with disfavor sooner or later. That is part of the reason of those dysfunction at those type of meetings is the fact the party, at that initial level, at the county convention level, has become so very, very unattended and so very, very weak. Again, we're going to see in the month of February for both political parties... [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

SENATOR SCHUMACHER: ...the open time for if you're interested in the things to get down to the election commissioner, sign up to be a delegate to your county convention, attend that thing, start the discussion to try to bring our parties to a common-sense issues and common-sense solutions, participate in the things. They are badly malfunctioning now; they result in, sometimes, idiot resolutions and we need to try to work with it if we're going to keep them. They are highly dysfunctional, part of the national dysfunction. But if it's going to be corrected, get down to the election commissioner; sign up and attend the things, because they're not working now. Thank

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

you. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Schumacher. Senator Crawford, you're recognized. [LB382]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: Thank you, Mr. President. We've talked on this floor again over and over about something that's very nonpartisan. And that is the importance of attracting and retaining people in our state, especially young people; but also attracting and recruiting and retaining people who are...who come to our state and be part of our work force, come to our state and be part of our population. Because of my background at Creighton, I see what it looks like, we bring young people to our state, they come to Creighton from lots of states and they come and are able to live in Nebraska for a few years and they realize that we have a lot to offer to them. They do internships in our state and then many of them stay here in our state and work and then raise their families here so that gives them an opportunity to be in our state for a while, experience the good life up front and then many of them chose to stay. Similarly, my district includes Offutt Air Force Base. And I can't tell you how many times I've heard this story from someone who is in Bellevue: When the military member first got their orders to come to Bellevue, this created hue and cry in the family. We're going to move to Nebraska? So then the military member brings their spouse and teenagers, literally sometimes, kicking and screaming. And then they arrive in Bellevue and then they have...after they're here for a year or two and they see the great schools and they, again, they see what Nebraska has to offer, then they often say that this is the best military community they've ever been in. One person said it was the best, by far, no close second community that they had lived in. But it took coming here and experiencing first hand for them to see that. And then some of them, many of them do decide to come back to Nebraska when they retire. So keeping Presidential elections competitive in our state is important to bringing people to our state. It's the young people who come and are engaged in this campaign work and, hopefully, they get to experience the good life up front and they may very well choose to come back or to stay. We also try to attract back to Nebraska people who have left for a while and encourage them to come back and make Nebraska their home. The only e-mail that I received on this issue was from one such person. It's a person who grew up in Nebraska and then has lived on the East Coast and the West Coast and Alaska for many years before returning here to raise her children. And she sent me an e-mail telling me that she is very disappointed that we're considering doing away with this divided electoral vote system, that she grew up here and was thrilled when she...that...that we were able to make this change, that Nebraska had proven that it can think independently. And then later she talks about how important this Nebraska tradition has been to her, not only splitting the electoral vote, but the fact that Nebraska has a tradition of senators in the past who would be independent and be mavericks and how important that Nebraska tradition was to her as a Nebraska native who is now coming back to Nebraska. And she ends the e-mail saying: we expect you to research

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

an issue and to vote based on the honest, compromised... [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

SENATOR CRAWFORD: ...approaches to our problems. Thank you, Mr. President. Please think for yourself. The people of Nebraska have been proud to have so many visionaries and mavericks in our politics, people who can think and act independently. Let's keep this tradition alive. And I say, yes, let's keep this tradition alive of doing what's best for Nebraska, thinking independently, thinking about what the public purpose of our bills is, thinking about what the public negative consequences of our bills could be and vote no on LB382. Thank you. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Crawford. Senator Chambers, you're recognized to close on your amendment. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the Legislature, Senator Crawford made some very cogent comments. I look around as things are being said, and I saw out of the corner of my left eye Senator Kintner holding up one of the pillars in the Chamber. But he's very attentive from the way I analyzed it. You never know who is hearing what you will say. And you never know which part of what you say might take effect. So when the opportunity is there to speak, take it would be my advice which I do not expect to be accepted. But when you hear "Professor" Schumacher lay these factors out and they become a part of the record, it will give some people who are somewhat naive in terms of how the inner workings of these political processes take place, they'll get an idea of what really occurs. The parties have the kind of clout in this state where they put a lot of, what I consider, trash into the statutes. Why itemize what happens at a political party's convention...why do you put that in the statute? Because the parties can do it. And I don't think the people who run these parties...I think of them like I think of ostriches. They're not overburdened with brains. And it shows when they put stuff into the statute, this fellow Bacon that I mention from time to time, he said: writing makes an exact man. If, I would add, that person pays attention to what he is writing, and Bacon came along at a time when only the masculine pronoun was used. Now people at least say "he or she." What the Supreme Court does when it's writing the rules that govern judges, instead of saying the judge shall do this and he also shall do that, they will continue to use the two words "the judge" rather than say "he or she" or provide any gender designation. Language is important and people use language for a certain purpose and they know that there are some people who will pay attention to it, and others won't. But because others won't, should you lower the standard? Let language become so common that the words have no real meaning? That's what happens, and it happens on the floor of this Legislature and it would happen in statutes if I didn't try to stop it. I wasn't here when this kind of stuff got into the books. I will renew an offer that I made from time to time, if I'm adequately rewarded, if I'm adequately compensated, let us say, because it's not a reward, it's kind of a punishment, I will start

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

with page 1 of volume 1 of the Nebraska statutes and go through page by page, make notations of what I think ought to be there and what ought not to be there; what is redundant, what is foolish... [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...what has no purpose being there. I wish Senator Lautenbaugh were here so nobody think I'm saying it behind his back, but I said it when he was here, put stuff in a proposal that he wants enacted into law and he doesn't even know what it means. And often I will say, we have an obligation to be clear in what we put into the statute books because that's giving the public notice of what they're allowed to do and what they are forbidden to do. But thank you, Mr. President, I'll have an opportunity to speak at another time. Thank you. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Chambers. You've heard the closing on the reconsider motion by Senator Chambers. The question is, shall the reconsider...Senator Chambers. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I would like a call of the house. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: There's been a request to place the house under call. The question is, shall the house be placed under call? All those in favor vote aye; opposed, nay. Senators Burke Harr, Mello, I'm sorry...please record. [LB382]

ASSISTANT CLERK: 32 ayes, 1 nay to go under call, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: The house is under call. Senators, please record your presence. Those unexcused senators please return to the Chamber and record your presence. All unauthorized personnel please leave the floor. The house is under call. Senators Burke Harr, Mello, Lathrop...Senator Harms, Senator Larson, Bolz and Davis, please return to the Chamber. The house is under call. Senator Burke Harr, please return to the Chamber. The house is under call. Senator Larson, please return to the Chamber. Senator Chambers, everyone is accounted for, how would you like to proceed? [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Roll call vote. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Mr. Clerk, there's been a request for a roll call vote. [LB382]

ASSISTANT CLERK: (Roll call vote taken, Legislative Journal pages 403-404.) The vote is 7 ayes, 26 nays on the motion to reconsider, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: The reconsider motion fails. Raise the call. Next item, Mr. Clerk. [LB382]

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Chambers would move to amend with FA179. (Legislative Journal page 370.) [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Senator Chambers, you are recognized to open on your amendment. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, this is an amendment whose purpose is to remove some language from the existing law. Starting on page 2, in line 13, I'm going to read the language that would be stricken by this amendment: "The convention shall formulate and promulgate a state platform, select a state central committee, select electors for President and Vice President of the United States, and transact the business which is properly before it." Why does that need to be in the statute? If there were, at the time this was put into the statutes, a group of women who have what's known as a sewing circle, should they put into the statute what it is they intend to do? If there were a group organized under the rubric Boy Scouts of America, should you put into the statute what they do at their little meetings? These political parties are too puffed up and they make themselves appear more important than they are. Since in most instances, everybody in the Legislature belongs to one party or the other, they can get anything into the statute books they please. I'm going to go back to what I was saying when my time ran out. How does anybody know what they're allowed to do and what they're prohibited from doing? This is one of the books, one of the volumes in the set of volumes comprising the Nebraska statutes. But this is an older one, stamped on the front of it is the year 1995. And in this volume are the papers, copies of the papers, that relate to when and how Nebraska became a member of this Union. And if we stay on this bill, which I expect my hardheaded colleagues of the "Repelican" persuasion to do, I'm going to read into the record some of the information from those papers which even Senator Kintner doesn't know about. He'd know about some of it if he listened to me the other day. But the part I will emphasize is how Nebraska was held up in terms of being allowed into the Union because they did not have a guarantee that they would let people vote who were not of the white persuasion. And the President of the United States at that time was a man named Andrew Johnson who was as big a racist as you can find. He is the one which you all may not realize who gave a blanket pardon to everybody who had participated in the late and recent rebellion--Andrew Johnson. And to show what a racist he was, when legislation was passed creating the Freedmen's Bureau, and you all don't care what that is, and you don't know what it was, Andrew Johnson vetoed it. But it was this Andrew Johnson, because he was the President, who had to more or less comply with what Congress had stated in a law that told how a territory shall become a state, a member of the Union. And Nebraska was accepted for admission into the Union conditionally. They had to put into their organic law or constitution that the right of the franchise would not be withheld from anybody because of their race. Nebraska was discriminating then, and the only reason they stopped was because they couldn't get into the Union doing that.

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

And to this day, 2014, I, who am a descendant of those who were discriminated against in this country, have to fight against this kind of legislation designed to discriminate and take from people the effectiveness of a franchise. And if Senator Janssen and his ilk will say, well, these people can still vote, the impact of what would happen if this thing became law is that you could cast a vote, but you'd be voting for nobody. And that's what happens when they gerrymander. And the U.S. Supreme Court has said a vote means more than marking a ballot or pulling the lever on one of these machines. It means having the right and the opportunity to cast a meaningful vote that can have a bearing on the outcome of an election. When you create a one-party structure in a one-party state, anybody who is not a part of that structure and that party casts a vote which is a vote in name only. It is a meaningless exercise that has no significance, no consequence whatsoever. The other day, yesterday, Senator Murante had said, if you cast a vote for a candidate who loses, you might say your vote was thrown away. But he's of the opinion that it was not. If you have a fair system, then what he said would have validity. But when you have a skewed system such as the "Repelicans" are trying to put in place now, your vote means nothing. You're not a participant in an activity that carries any real significance. And in 2014, what I look at is not what these hypocrites talk about in terms of how great America is, because I know that's a lie. I'm 76 years old. It was a lie before I was born, it was a lie when I was an infant, it was a lie when I was a teenager, it was a lie when I was an adolescent, it was a lie when I was a young man, it's a lie now that I'm an old man. And it will always be a lie. But what I look at is when America gets on their hobby horse and talks about there should be democratic elections in other countries like Egypt. And when a man they don't like was democratically elected, President Morsi, America joined those who illegally drummed him out of office, America, the one talking about democratic elections. When Hamas won an election, a democratic election, the Israelis and the Americans branded Hamas a terrorist organization. They like elections when they come out the way these white people and Jewish people want them to come out in the Middle East. And when somebody is elected according to the rules laid down by the Israelis and the Americans, and despite all that these two groups do wins the election, but they don't like it, they reject the outcome of the election. And I'm not making it up. That is recent history; it can qualify as a current event because the impact is still carrying on right now. And then we have this kind of thing happening on the floor of this Legislature. And these people want to talk about a democracy. That's why I get fed up that I'm stronger than the rest of you. Because if you were in a setting like this and the tables were turned, you'd be like Senator Lautenbaugh--gone all the time. But I'll stay here and I'll contest with you, I will fight with you, I will wrangle with you, and we'll go at it like two scorpions in a bottle, because I am not going to quit, I am not going to relent, I will not be run off. And what I love is to have these white people put into Public Pulse, he ought to go back where he came from. Well, I came from 25th and Indiana Avenue, because that's where I was born, in Omaha. So I'm where I came from. And then they name a country and say I'll pay his one-way ticket. They don't have a pot to urinate in and they're going to talk about giving me a one-way ticket to some place in Africa. I was talking out at Norfolk

Transcript Prepared By the Clerk of the Legislature
Transcriber's Office

Floor Debate
January 29, 2014

one time and some idiotic white man in the audience said: why don't you go back to where you came from. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: One minute. [LB382]

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And the people were very embarrassed, but I waited until their murmuring settled down. I said: I want to tell this white man something, if we all go back to where we came from, he and I will link arms and go back to Africa because that's where the scientists have determined the human race originated. So when you tell me to go back to Africa where I've never been, if I were going to go back, I'd say, come on, brother, let's both go home. Let's go to our motherland, let's go to our fatherland. That's the stuff I put up with all the time. But I'll stay here and I will operate under rules that I voted against. And I won't win all the time, but I won't lose all the time either. And I don't reckon winning and losing the way other people do. I win when I do what my conscious tells me I'm supposed to do and I'll do it with a vengeance when necessary, and that's the way I'm going to do it on this bill. Thank you, Mr. President. [LB382]

SENATOR KRIST: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Mr. Clerk, items. [LB382]

ASSISTANT CLERK: Thank you, Mr. President. Your Committee on Enrollment and Review reports LB144 to Select File. Motion from Senator Mello to withdraw LB1024, that will be laid over. New resolution, LR428 by Senator Kolowski will be laid over. Have notice of committee hearing from the Retirement Committee. Amendments to be printed from Senator Larson to LB597; Senator Hadley to LB986. Name adds: Senator Bloomfield to LB855; Senators Campbell and Gloor to LB1092. (Legislative Journal pages 404-406.) [LB144 LB1024 LR428 LB597 LB986 LB855 LB1092]

And finally, Mr. President, a priority motion: Senator Janssen would move to adjourn until Thursday, January 30, at 9:00 a.m.

SENATOR KRIST: You've heard the motion. All those in favor, aye. Opposed, nay. We are adjourned.