

the midst of making what I thought were very meritorious points. However, obviously the rest of the body didn't feel so, but I would like to continue and I was in the midst of questioning Senator Chambers, but I've had a chance to talk with him off the mike and so I do know that he will not succumb to my questioning in the way I'd like him to. So what I would like to do is submit some thoughts of my own which I do think are logical and as I see this particular motion and, by the way, I will not be voting for the reconsideration motion because I do believe that Senator Labeledz has a better alternative for us than LB 588 does present. However, I have told both Senator Chambers and Senator Labeledz that I would like to see us compromise, and I believe that's what this amendment has done. I would like to see it compromised just a little further and that compromise would mean to keep the district elections for the primary, as Senator Chambers is asking, but have it be the general election be at large as Senator Labeledz has suggested in her amendment, but then take one further step out of Senator Chambers' book and suggest that we do increase the number of commissioners to seven from five. The logic behind that, in my estimation, is one that is fairly simple. Douglas County has a very large population compared to any other county in the state, and while there are some counties that are at five and some counties that are at three commissioners, the amount of constituents, by taking Douglas County to seven, would be somewhere around 60,000 per commissioner. And I haven't done my arithmetic on Lancaster, but I would assume that is still a larger amount of people than the five in Lancaster County do support and I would assume that it is larger than any other county in the state as far as the number of constituents that each commissioner supports. So I could see going to seven commissioners and that would get towards what Senator Chambers is looking to and that is to have a chance for his district to have some chance of representation. I would submit that Senator Chambers is correct. Under the current method of electing, where all five are elected at large, that a minority election while it is theoretically possible, it's not a practical possibility. Secondly, I also suggest that Senator Labeledz's amendment would be a step towards a better possibility of electing a representative from Senator Chambers' area or the minority area, but I would submit that going to seven would give him an even better chance, of having a district represented by 60,000 people, he would have a better practical possibility and I would support that. But I do not think that we need to go all the way to district elections. I see some real benefit in going to a district primary and a general at