

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

May 7, 2003

LB 598

SENATOR TYSON: So I really...I don't have an answer to your question. I've never thought about it.

SENATOR RAIKES: Would you agree that it would seem, I guess I would say, more principle based, or less self-serving for the legislator if the Legislature's position was that term limits are not a good thing either for legislators or for executive branch officials?

SENATOR TYSON: Oh, yeah, I think that it wouldn't hurt a bit to be consistent. I don't...

SENATOR RAIKES: Can you think of a reason why term limits would make sense for an executive branch officer, a Governor or a Treasurer, and not for a legislator?

SENATOR TYSON: I don't even know where that...how long that has been in the constitution, as far as term limits for the State Treasurer and the Governor. But it would be consistent to say, no term limits at all. The argument for one would be a valid argument, I would think, for the other.

SENATOR RAIKES: Okay. Thank you, Senator Tyson. I would just offer that as a suggestion. The self-serving part has been suggested many times. I would like some reaction on that, if some of you have thoughts. Senator Schimek, may I ask you a question?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Schimek, would you respond to a question?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes.

SENATOR RAIKES: So what are your thoughts on this?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Well, first of all, the Treasurer traditionally deals with money issues. And we have had at least one instance I know of in our history when somebody who was elected to the office couldn't even be bonded. So it's a very sensitive position. And you can...