

15 percent of the registered voters, if every one of them voted for one candidate. As you well know, whether it's the Republican primary or the Democratic primary, you have a number of candidates. In the Republican primary you have at least five or six now and it's fair to say that a Kay Orr and a Nancy Hoch and a Kermit Brashear and, yes, an Everett Sileven are probably going to split up that vote. You're only dealing with 15 percent and if you give each of them three or four or five, it means the Governor is going to be picked by 3 or 4 or 5 percent of the voters. Most other states do have a runoff primary if no candidate gets 50 percent. Nebraska should and could do the same and we could do it with the E clause and have it affect this next election. I think it should. I think it's the only fair way, otherwise your party primary means nothing. Why does it mean nothing? Because no longer are issues involved. It's merely the candidate who puts together the money and through organization has his people or her people turn out. Let's use an example. Democratic side, you have four very strong candidates, Marge Higgins, Chris Beutler, apparently Helen Boosalis, David Domina. What, 43 percent or less are Democrats of the state, one-third of those turn out in a primary. You're down to less than 15 percent. Even if you gave one of them 25 or 30 percent in the primary, you're still down to 3 or 4 or 5 percent picking the candidate, picking the person who really is the next Governor. I'm not sure that's what a primary was intended. It was supposed to be a collection so that the party could reflect by a majority of the party who they wanted to be in that race, a party selection. That's the whole essence of a party primary. When you destroy the meaning of that party primary by making it whoever can simply get this little group or that little coalition, let's use an example. Labor unions or maybe a business organization or maybe a teachers' organization, let's say the teachers or 20,000 teachers, all they have to do is mobilize their people in a primary to vote as a block and turn out and vote and they have picked the candidate. That's not to condemn teachers. I could use any other example. I simply used teachers because we know the numbers and we know they are very organized and potent for us. My point is, if a primary is to be meaningful, it has to be a reflection of what a majority of that party want. Do I have selfish motives? Well, I suppose it could be argued, absolutely the contrary. I probably might be benefiting more if I were running in a primary, for the more in there the merrier because it means I would have to get a