

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

February 23, 2000 LB 510

state's attorney. One is the state's money counter, money holder, the State Treasurer. Do we want that person to be partisan? Why are we choosing just the Attorney General as the only nonpartisan choice we're making here? And I asked Senator Chambers this question and he gave an answer, but I guess I don't agree with the logic there, so I rise in opposition to this motion. When you think about the two-party system, a lot of people will say I'm tired of Washington or I'm tired of Lincoln where the parties are always fighting with each other. Well, think about the...think about the opposite side of the coin here. In Italy, they've had dozens of new constitutions, dozens of governments in the twentieth century alone because of all the fractured parties. The two-party system works well, and a nonpartisan Attorney General starts to degrade the two-party system. The two-party system has worked in America for over 200 years, it will continue to work, and the label of a party, while it doesn't tell you everything about a candidate, it does tell you something. And, as a voter, knowing something about a candidate is better than knowing nothing about a candidate. That party label does begin to tell you something about that person. I urge that the body stick with its vote and vote against the motion to reconsider. Thank you.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank you, Senator Bruning. Senator Landis, you are recognized to speak.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Madam President, members of the Legislature. Senator Bruning's speech I think goes to the merits of LB 510 and I think it's a position he's made clear before. Senator Bourne asks us a different question. Senator Bourne doesn't ask us the question, is LB 510 good or bad? Senator Bourne asks us the question, look, if I had family business and couldn't be here to vote on Final Reading, as well as six or seven of my other colleagues, would you let me have the opportunity to record my feelings in a vote by reconsidering and giving me the chance to get on the record? I don't know about you but I know what it's like to have a bill that has some controversy in it determined by attendance, and that's a shame. In the middle of the winter, it's hard to have these things determined by the attendance and the road conditions or, in some cases, family concerns. Now, look, if this was a deeply felt issue of huge moral import I could understand drawing a line in