

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

March 2, 2000

LB 1170

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. That's the understanding that I'd gotten, but I wanted to be sure I had it. There are two principles involved here, and they are warring in my mind. If an official is to be recalled, that to me should be a stand-alone proposition, for whatever reason or no reason. If people become dissatisfied enough with that official to get enough signatures to require a recall election to be held, that ought to be done, and not say in the law that the ones seeking to recall this person must run another candidate. Maybe this person is not a part of an organization, does not want the position himself or herself, is not going to go out and beat the bushes and have somebody else put a name on there just to have a name, but is genuinely upset about this person. And let's say that you're in one of those smaller towns where people know everybody, there is a general dissatisfaction, but everybody is afraid to take a step against this official. One person is not afraid, but that person does not want the office, and nobody else wants to have his name put on the ballot to be identified by this individual as an opponent. And the recall election may not succeed. So they ought to be two distinct items. You seek to recall that individual, and then you determine who is going to fill that position. I think it is unfair and I think it is not in keeping with democratic principles, with a small "d", to say that you're going to create the right of recall, but it's going to be administered in such a way as to discourage people who have a legitimate gripe. Remember, a person is not recalled because I want the person recalled. The person is not recalled because I get enough signatures on a petition to have his or her name put on the ballot. The person is recalled if a majority of those voting agree. And that should be sufficient and the office would then be vacant. Then any and everybody, whether they are courageous or cowardly, whether they are civic-minded or slothful, can offer his or her name as one to fill that office. But I think wedding the two together is one of the worst policies. And all due respect, Senator Smith, this is no reflection on you because you brought the bill, but these kind of issues I am sensitive about. I don't want us to create by legislative fiat a set of circumstances that protects people who are in office, whose record may not be what it ought to be, which cannot withstand scrutiny. And if we say that a condition...