

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

January 9, 2006 LB 542

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes, only those who will have two additional years after this, yes, they're the only ones, plus those who could run again, after those two years.

SENATOR STUTHMAN: But Senator Chambers, those individuals, realistically, they are termed out.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes, they are.

SENATOR STUTHMAN: They are termed out, and it says, term-limited out. Yes, they are members of the Legislature, but they are term-limited out. They are still here, but they're term-limited out.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But they...

SENATOR STUTHMAN: So I think there is some real problem with the wordage there, and that's why I support your part of the bill, unless you understand this totally different, Senator Chambers, in explaining the "term-limited out." That's the problem that I have.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Because they put in the language "in January, 2007," they're referring to that first 20 or however many there are, who will get the ax at the end of this session that we're serving now. None of them could serve.

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR STUTHMAN: Yes, this is very true, but if I'm fortunate to get reelected this year, as of January next year, of the swearing-in ceremony of January 5, 6, 7, or when it is, I'll be sworn in, but I am termed out. I can't run again for another term. I will be there, hopefully, for another four years, but I am termed out.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: You know what? As you mention it, the language is ambiguous, and based on what you're saying, that argument could be made. So it might just be one of those sweeps that would get...in effect, get everybody. So it would be best to do away with it for even a stronger reason than the one I had