

February 27, 1996 LR 46

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you. I'll go back and start over. Senator Jones. Senator Cudaback. Senator Wehrbein. Senator Kristensen.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you, Madam President, members of the Legislature. And, Senator Schimek, I didn't catch all of your amendment. I assume that it's sort of "me too" or "us too"? And that brings back the whole philosophic debate. Quite frankly, in the constitution it is unwise to begin to start to except people based on population. That isn't good policy because of the following reasons. One is that populations are going to change, and then you're going to have to change the constitution to match those population changes. Two, is if the policy is good for the state, and this is a state Legislature, I understand out of political compromise sometimes statutes will be given towards areas, Omaha, Lincoln, or smaller, for political reasons. And statutes can change and politics can change. But if you're going to have a constitution, you ought to put in what's fundamentally the correct thing to do and the policy. And if, by statute, you want to change how those are implemented, that's fine. But I just find Senator Chambers' language, to put these exceptions, to be unacceptable. If he's done that as a matter of delaying or...well, not delaying, as a matter of criticizing the bill (sic) or trying to convince people that it shouldn't be done, or to try to divide it and conquer it, that's acceptable legislative tactics. But in good policy I can't support any of the constitutional things where we're going to start making exceptions based on population. Senator Hillman, we have obviously a lot of people to talk, so I want to take some time with you as well. In the Revenue Committee, this is one section that is extremely important to me in the revenue picture, and the reason is dealing with the area of townships, mergers, and the ability to put together different entities. There is an Article XV, Section 18, which allows us to do some joint things, we'll want to talk about that. But Article IX, Section 4 requires that we provide for the election of county and township officers. And it doesn't say may provide for by law; it says "we shall provide by law the election of county and township officers". In your opinion, would it not be possible, under your constitutional language, to elect a county administrator as the only elected county officer, and make that person sort of the county mayor or whatever, under the language? And the reason I say that is I think in other states that's what's occurred, is that you have elected one person to