

that is very closer, that would make them much closer than any of the other Supreme Court judicial districts. Likewise it would also give a couple of Lancaster County legislative districts, the 27th and 46th would be moved into that northern half of the congressional district division and would be placed in the third judicial district. One of the reasons I want to do that is that two-thirds of the lawyers in the first congressional district are found in Lancaster County and the thought was that by at least taking a small chunk of Lancaster County and placing it with the third judicial district there would be more of a pool of lawyers to look at when a decision is made. I think it is important that the Governor have that opportunity to pick the very best person possible for the Supreme Court when filling a vacancy. So I think that was important as well but most important of all is I think it brings about a contiguousness to the judicial districts that otherwise would not be there and I would certainly encourage your strong support for this amendment. I will leave it at that point and be free to answer questions if you have any.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Cullan.

SENATOR CULLAN: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, again I rise to oppose an attempt to amend the work that the Miscellaneous Subject Committee did in this regard, particularly here where Senator Wesely, irrespective of how he phrases it, is trying to get another Supreme Court justice in Lancaster County. Senator Wesely again, as with the previous amendment, unnecessarily divides the county again, a proposal to violate one of the guidelines which the Miscellaneous Subjects Committee used in drawing the various maps. Now there are other potential maps that make more sense that could accomplish Senator Wesely's objectives so far as not crossing the Platte River that would not have to split Lancaster County. So let us not be fooled by Senator Wesely's talk about the Platte River. His attempt is nothing more than to ensure that Lancaster County would have two Supreme Court justices. They already have two, very excellent members of the court. I think three is pushing it a little much, Senator Wesely, and you probably ought to withdraw your proposal. But he isn't likely to do that. I would urge you to oppose the Wesely amendment.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Nichol. Is Senator Nichol in the room? Senator Marsh.

SENATOR MARSH: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, Senator Wesely, do I understand this is something you say