

And Senator Smith also was concerned about not being accountable for a long period of time if they are all elected at the same time and Senator Chambers did point out that we used to have those elections at large and they used to be all at one time and, as a matter of fact, I believe there was an election where we had seven councilmen and six of them were turned out at one time. We had practically a complete revamping of our city council. We had six new members out of the seven come in. The only one that was retained by the way, Senator Smith, was the lone woman on the council at that time, so, obviously, the voters did show some good discretion there, and it happened. The city did not come to its knees, the city did not fall apart, the council moved on, the government moved on. So we do have accountability and it is not replaced by irresponsibility. It happens, it goes on. Also, we've had a mayor that has been recalled and so to say, suggest that we have a lack of accountability in our system, I don't think is a good argument. We have shown on at least two major occasions that if the voters are not pleased with what is happening in those offices, we have remedies and they are exercised. We talked about saving money, we talked about whether it is a good idea or not to have them in off years. I agree with Senator Chambers. I don't know that it's all that necessary that they be in out years. I would not have an objection to putting the elections at the same time on the even years as we have for our state and county officials, as Senator Lynch said. I don't have an objection with that. That isn't the proposal right before us. That is not...it would be a significant change from the bill that is before us because we're talking about the term of the mayor changing as well and the terms of all the city council people changing as well and maybe it's okay. I don't have a problem with it, but it's a major change from what this bill addresses. What we are trying to address with this bill, what Senator Chambers and the City of Omaha is trying to address is the fact that we have low voter turnout. It is costing us a \$100,000 in the city property taxes, \$100,000 over the four-year period to run this election for less than 20 percent voter turnout of the eligible voters. It doesn't seem to be working very well the way it is. Finally, Senator Lynch says, will this do any good? I think it's a valid question. I don't know. It may not, but it's not going to be any worse and it is certainly going to...it would be as good as we have, it may get better voter turnout because you have the whole city involved by each district being represented along with the mayor, the whole city is involved. You might have better participation but you will have no worse and you can save