

exemplified the same boundaries you have here in this committee amendment. I think that we are here because of a Supreme Court decision. And I think that that Supreme Court decision somewhat changed the attitude that some of us had about redistricting, because I didn't support the plan that went through here last...last year, in 1991. But I think the Supreme Court has said we need to rectify some problems with that plan, and those problems happen to be District 40 and District 18. So I think that our objectives have changed a little bit, or mine have. And it means that we now need to take a very hard look right at these particular...this particular part of Nebraska. We don't have a Supreme Court decision relating to any other part of the plan. And so as far as I'm concerned we...we should be taking them...taking their decree and then studying that, and doing what we've done. LB 7 was also drafted by my office, but I didn't introduce it because I found, when I got to the floor that day, that Senator Conway had already had the same plan drafted. It's a very simple plan, it disenfranchised two people who had made it through the primary. But, I think, in reading the Attorney General's decision that he sent to Senator Johnson, it pretty well excuses the fact that we can come back and redistrict a part of this thing. We also then need to do the least damage that would be possible, and I think this plan does that, it does the least amount of damage. My estimation is that if we don't do something this session that we are somewhat derelict in what the Supreme Court has dictated. And if we don't do something, it's my opinion the Supreme Court will. I think that we should probably be more solicitous of the Supreme Court decision and try to do something here that we at least can agree with, because what they do we may not agree with. We have the plan, the ball is in our court, and I think we should run with it. And we have a plan that does what the three senators who have most involvement with agree on, and so I'm supporting the amendment, and I'm supporting LB 7, and I hope that the rest of you will do the same thing. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Dierks. Senator Elmer, you're next.

SENATOR ELMER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What I intend to address here is mostly to put into the record the motivations for introducing a statewide plan which I introduced to the committee yesterday morning. As you know, the Supreme Court decision, in Day v. Nelson, stated that if a county has a proper number of people to be within the population parameters that are