

April 24, 1979

LB 345

SENATOR PIRSCH: And then...

SENATOR NEWELL: Of course, if they do it now they gain the experience so that...

SENATOR PIRSCH: Experience?

SENATOR NEWELL: You bet. They gain the experience...

SENATOR PIRSCH: I think they have the experience. It will just have to be redone then in two years.

SENATOR NEWELL: That's right. That's correct. It will have to be redone in two years, but that...or maybe longer depending upon how quickly they get the census thing worked out, etc. I don't see that there is the cost savings. Thank you, Senator Pirsch. I don't see the cost savings. I don't think that Senator Pirsch has ulterior motives. Some others may have, however, and for that reason I think that this is...the two year delay is unnecessary. It's not a great disadvantage or extra work or anything like that. It needs to be done. That's why we've got this compromise. That's why I've accepted the compromise, and that's why we should leave the bill in the present form.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Johnson.

SENATOR JOHNSON: Members of the body, I, like Senator Newell would urge this body to reject the Pirsch amendment. I can appreciate what Senator Pirsch is attempting to do, but the amendment itself is certainly not necessary as a cost saving device. You might take a look at the fiscal note to LB 345 in the bill book. Our fiscal analyst says, (a) there is no cost to the state for this bill. He says, (b) there could be some small cost to the county, but we don't even know what that would be. Jack Mills, the head of the County Officials Association has a fiscal note appended. It says no cost to the county. At most all that will happen in Douglas County will be for the Election Commissioner to spend a little bit of time with his staff just drawing out the boundaries, but they do that all the time anyhow. I mean, that is the only cost that's even inherent in this bill, and what's a good idea now needs to be implemented now, not postponed for two or three years. If the idea has merit it should come into being now and should not be delayed for two or three years. If it's without merit then vote against the bill, but of course this is a very meritorious proposal. So it seems to me that this body should reject the Pirsch amendment, readvance this bill to