

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

April 13, 1999 LB 729

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, and members of the Legislature, I'm opposed to this bill for reasons other than those stated by my friend, Senator Quetzalcoatl. He's not even listening. Oh, yes, he is. Okay. He's got two ears, he listens to me with one and Senator Redfield with the other, then he processes it all on one half of the brain for Senator Redfield, on the other half for me. Thank you, Senator Quandahl. I will say the name correctly this time, but I'm going to catch you one of these times. I don't want...I want these petitions, since it's deemed that the people know so much, I want them to be messed up just like they are. I don't want the constitution butchered but let these people do their butchery on their petitions, and let them go ahead and get it on the ballot, and let the public vote for something which is as messed up as many of these things have been because it is not, in my opinion, the responsibility of the Legislature to correct the foolishness of some of these people who are going to support these petitions and have them placed on the ballot. The constitution, as written, says in effect let the people be fools, if they choose to be fools. If they want to get the advice of a mule skinner on how to write a petition to be submitted for placement on the ballot, let them do it. If there are enough fools out there to agree and they say, yeah, put this in the constitution, let them do it. Then take it to court and let the judges say this is foolishness. You should have told the mule skinner, stick to your skinning of mules. That's one who drives mules by the way, they don't actually take the skin off of them with a knife. What Senator Schimek is apparently attempting to do is to get something brought by an individual or a group into a form that on its face appears to be constitutional. Let us say that this bill were in effect and one of these propositions would be brought to the Secretary of State who would say I don't it passes muster. So somebody takes it to court to challenge what the Secretary of State ruled. The court overrules the Secretary of State. Those who are circulating the petition will take that and use it to tell the public the court has already endorsed what we're doing; now you can vote for it. The court has said this is good, this ought to be a part of the constitution. Then the other side will run around saying that's not what the court said. The court didn't say that. All they said was that it will...well, it doesn't violate the law and it's not unconstitutional, and the other