

Districts. I have been opposed to the bill as it has advanced across the floor, not for the reasons that I think are sometimes discussed in the minds of some as to where people might come from but my opposition was one of two items. One was the concern for multidistricts of office-holders, two in this case, two or more possibly in the future. My other concern was that as the districts get larger the chance for effective voter review becomes less. That argument does not seem to prevail and once accepting that neither one of those positions perhaps had support, then it seems to me that the logical thing to do is to look at a single statewide selection of our Supreme Court Judges because the aim ought to be to have the best seven individuals that can be selected irregardless of where they may live in the state. So what the amendment does is require that at least six more nominees would be submitted through the judicial nominating committees to the Governor and that the Governor then would make a selection, taking into account appropriate geographic distribution of the judges as they are appointed. It seems to me it provides a larger selection of qualified people in which to select. It still retains geographic consideration. I think the practical effect of that requirement in the Constitution would be carried out by any Governor. It seems to me, again, if you accept that you want the best seven individuals that you can have, I see very little relationship to geographic consideration as to the background of the individuals, their legal knowledge, the kind of experience they may have had through their legal work, those kinds of considerations are not dictated by where their residence happens to be. So it would seem to me that if a change is appropriate and if gerrymandering is a concern with any kind of district, you could have gerrymandering with a congressional district as well, it would seem to me that a simple approach and a direct approach is a statewide selection as proposed by the amendment and I would urge the body to adopt it.

SPEAKER MARVEL PRESIDING

SPEAKER MARVEL: Is there any further discussion on the Warner amendment to LB 261? Senator Hoagland, do you wish to be recognized?

SENATOR HOAGLAND: I do, Mr. Speaker and colleagues. I stand to oppose the Warner amendment to LB 261. I believe that the Warner amendment, I welcome this debate on Senator Warner's amendment because I think that his amendment reflects one of the principal strengths to the bill. I think his amendment points to one of the principal strengths of this bill and that is that this bill guarantees geographical distribution of