

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

February 10, 2000 LB 510

Jefferson going toe to toe. That's what makes this country great. And this particular bill, while it won't erode our democracy, it's a beginning of that erosion. The two-party system is what makes this country great. That's why Senator Schimek, a Democrat, and myself, a Republican, are both in opposition. Because, as you begin to erode that...that system where the two parties are in conflict with one another, you begin to erode the democracy. I urge a vote against this bill. Thank you.

**PRESIDENT MAURSTAD:** Thank you, Senator Bruning. Senator Chambers, on the advancement of LB 510.

**SENATOR CHAMBERS:** Mr. President and members of the Legislature, "Baron" Tyson referred to me as ignorant because he felt I didn't know Senator Bruning's age and had not done research. Well, my response is that "Baron" Tyson does not pay attention, because I said that I first offered this bill in 1972, before Senator Bruning was born or shortly thereafter. Senator Tyson does not pay attention. Three years after birth would be shortly after a person was born. So, when you consider that you have Senator Tyson and Senator Bruning consulting with each other, it's no surprise that Senator Tyson would come away with a misperception and a misunderstanding. However, my job is to set the record straight when somebody refers to me in something I'm doing and they are in error, and Senator Tyson definitely was in error on that point as he is about this bill. If I were of a mind to try to bring about a nonpartisan election of all of these various constitutional officers, that's what I would have been attempting to do down through the years. This is the only office that I have sought to make nonpartisan and it is a bill in this form that I have brought several times in the past. This is an example of why it may not be good to have people in the Legislature who have been here only a short time, because they have no institutional memory, and most senators are either too busy or lacking in inclination to learn the history of a particular bill. Sometimes it would be good if a person would take the time to do that and allow the responses to a piece of legislation to be cerebral rather than visceral or glandular. But I can understand those glandular reactions whenever I'm presenting something. But this is one of those bills that does not have to be brought into that realm of discourse. So I say