

just felt that...that the system we have now is working okay and so why do we need this proposal. But I was also concerned about the constitutionality of it and this is what I received back and you can read it for yourself if you care to. But it goes on to say, the amendments to LB 579 have not altered the list of the candidate members submitted by the political parties to the Governor for selection. Therefore, we reiterate our earlier opinion that this method of restricting the Governor's selection is constitutionally suspect under Article IV, Section 10, of the Constitution of the State of Nebraska. And that's about all I have to say. Senator Pirsch, I would give the rest of my time to you.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Senator Hefner, and members of the Legislature, I just offered this amendment because I want to raise three flags, three red flags of danger. The first concern that I have is that the election commissioners from across the state have written me that they object to this change. But, secondly, the Lancaster County Attorney wrote me today to also encourage me to vote against 579 and talked about the attorneys' conformity and the cost. And the cost caught my eye. The A bill on this is \$191,190 for the first year and 139 for the second. But according to this letter from the Lancaster County Election Commissioner, Wisconsin's similar office cost is a half a million annually and South Carolina's presidential year cost was 2.9 million, and the off-year cost was 1.8 million. And she raised the question of will the actual cost be more than what is written into this bill? But the third and final flag that bothers me is the Attorney General's Opinion, not only of May 16th but if you have read the Attorney General's Opinion in April 19th, and that's page 1731 in your Journal, the Attorney General talks about the constitution...constitutional office of the Secretary of State and the encroachment that this would be. A Constitution being the paramount law of the state designed to separate the powers of government and to define their extent and limit their exercise by the several departments as well as to secure and protect private rights, no other instrument is of equal significance. Every positive delegation of power to one officer or department implies a negation of its exercise by any other officer, department or person. If it did not, the whole constitutional fabric might be undermined and destroyed. The specter of the unconstitutionality of this creation is, quite frankly, the problem that bothers me the most and, therefore, I wanted to bring this to your attention before we voted for this on Final Reading. The Attorney General, in this letter, also