

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

February 7, 1997 LB 103

know I don't think we're embarrassed about that. And in fact, even if people did think it was a little strange for a number of years, in recent years, state, after state, after state has examined the unicameral system. I think Minnesota being one of the most recent states to look at our system. And they may never pass a bill that promotes the unicameral, that establishes a unicameral, but I can't help but feeling...but feel that there...

SENATOR CROSBY: One minute.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: ...are a lot of states who recognize how accountable our system is and why they should be looking at it, even if it would not be in their self-interest to do so. Senator Kristensen also advances the argument that this does not work, that this particular system does not work. And I would argue that it's worked twice, it's worked very well. What happened in 1992? What happened in 1996? The electoral vote was cast as the people in those congressional districts voted. Just because they all happened to go one way or the other doesn't mean it didn't work, it just means that there wasn't a split in the electoral vote. I think that split in the electoral vote is exceedingly important as an expression of the...

SENATOR CROSBY: Time.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: ...people.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Senator Kristensen.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you, Madam President. I want to point out a couple of ideas, structurally, that I think are wise to consider. Realize that under this system that you could win the popular vote in the state of Nebraska and win it rather convincingly. But you could only get three of the electoral votes, and that the opponent that you beat would get two electoral votes. So, in effect, for winning the state of Nebraska you get one vote and you won the entire state. Structurally that's not sound, that's not wise to do. And when Senator Schimek was talking about I said it didn't work, I'm