

February 28, 1995 LB 65

appreciates that process. The amendment, basically, does the following. It says, look, we've got two groups of people at loggerheads over an issue that most people really don't care that much about, and it, basically, says that, look, we have a process right now that has worked that's a little different, and we have a process in the past that worked that isn't a lot different from what other states have done. This amendment, basically, says the following. We had one presidential election with the new system where each congressional district would have at least one electoral vote to go to the majority of their voters, and nothing happened. In other words, all districts voted the same way. This amendment, basically, says we will have three other presidential elections, the one in '96, the one in 2000, and the one in 2004, in order to give a fair chance for the new process to be effective, and also to give Nebraskans a chance to actually figure out if it is a process that they like or not. I would be really intrigued, for example, if in the Third District, Second District, or First District, if, in fact, those districts voted in the majority different from the State of Nebraska as a whole, how they would actually feel knowing that their vote counted and they had an electoral vote for their presidential candidate. And I think, if and when that would happen, those people would finally look at it and say, I like that, my vote counted, I think it's great. So we'd give the presidential elections, we'd have three other presidential elections, and then as a comp...my compromise to the other side, I'd say, look, in the year 2006, January 1, it sunsets. That's two years after the final presidential election of 2004. It sunsets. This new law that we have now would sunset. We'd go back to the way it was, and at that particular point, the people of Nebraska, if they really found out they liked the new process we have now, would be able to make a case to the Legislature and they would say...be able to say, we don't want to change. And we would then have a discussion in the year 2006, whichever of us would still be here, or all of the new people that would be here in 2006, as to whether or not we should continue on the old way or continue with the new way that's been experimented with. That's all the amendment does. It grants both sides a victory. On the one side it says that in 2006 we will go back to the old way, no questions asked, and on the other side, it says that we will experiment for three years...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: ...and then we will, if there is a