

January 14, 1992

dividing the state into four areas rather than three, and four is much more workable than three because our committees have eight members, two members from each committee. Very logical, as I see it, has nothing to do with power politics, who's going to control, all of that enters into the whole ball of wax here. But if you have either three or six, you're not going to have even distribution among the members of the committee from the various areas of the state. So, as I see it, we should stay with some sort of a four-group Committee on Committees proposal.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Lamb. Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, I would speak very briefly in behalf of the Hartnett proposal. Four or five years ago, three years ago, I forget, losing my memory as far as when events took place, Senator Vard Johnson brought forth to the Legislature a proposition that we should be caucusing in Committee on Committees based on Congressional district representation. He was told by Senator Lamb at that time, I have reread Senator Lamb's remarks at that time, and by Senator Moore at that time, both of whom had indicated that we need to wait until after the census has been taken, we should not be making that change at that particular time. Now maybe they will say, well, they didn't really mean that at that time, but I, you know, reviewed the record and I think it's fairly clear what was said at that time. It is now after the census has been completed we are now here, when we started talking about the three methodology people brought up some very legitimate sorts of concerns. When you place them into Congressional district there really is no unanimity commonality of membership within the caucuses, and that made some sense. What Senator Hartnett has done...and if you would take the time to look at them, and I know not many people have, this has not been a major item and you're kind of just going to be voting on instinct, which happens, and that's fine, but if you look at the districts the way Senator Hartnett has laid them out under the six, there is a commonality of interest. The first district contains people primarily centered around the area of Lincoln. The second one has the rural area in the southeastern part of the state. The third one is the Omaha suburban area. The fourth one is the north central part of the state. The fifth one is the central part of Omaha, and the sixth one is the western part of the state, bringing senators together in a pattern where their geographic interests are the same. So I think what Senator Hartnett has done here is given us a good compromise from moving to the three and