

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. Senator Withem.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Members of the body, I'd like to respond to both comments by Senator Witek and by Senator Chambers. Senator Witek, I'd appreciate it if you could open your bill book to page 3 of the bill, this amendment would insert language, after line 3, on page 3 of LB 65, the Final Reading copy, that would in effect reinsert the language that is being stricken by LB 65. This is not something new. This is not some new cockamamie idea that we're coming up with. This, in effect, would return the language to the way the statutes now read with respect to presidential electors being bound. It's not a new idea, it's one we've had in Nebraska, I think, at least through one presidential cycle and not others. During the debate on LB 65 I think both sides, Senator Schimek said one of the problems with LB 65 was that it struck the binding of the presidential electors, and that was an argument she used to say LB 65 was a bad bill. Senator Kristensen said a number of times that he didn't object to the electors being bound and that he would be, I think at one time he said he wasn't going to support an amendment unless it brought more votes to the bill, but that was early stage of the debate and I'm glad...I'm glad to see he has somewhat modified his position on that. So this isn't a new issue, it's just that nobody bothered to bring an amendment forward. And when nobody else did, I thought it was important enough an issue to bring before the body. So in terms of Senator Witek's assertion that this is some new idea that came out of the blue that nobody had ever thought of before, that certainly is not the case. And I agree with Senator Bernard-Stevens that there is no timeliness as to when an idea is a good idea. Just because it's not thought of until a bill's on Final Reading doesn't make it a bad idea, but that doesn't apply in this case. Senator Chambers, you're bringing up a very intriguing argument, I think it's a good exercise as it relates to the discussion of power between the federal government, primacy of the U.S. Constitution versus state statutes, what the intent of the original constitution was. Those are all very interesting questions and are interesting ones to debate. As everybody here knows, I think, including you, better than anybody, these are the sorts of questions that ultimately would have to be resolved within a court of law. And I suppose what would happen would be we would have to choose an elector, that elector would have to vote no differently, you would have to be chosen as an elector representing the Republican Party of