

May 11, 1981

LB 89

with it and now the same situation is here with Lancaster County. The judiciary is saying they need it. The Bar concurs. I think it is irresponsible to go along with it. Now I am not opposed to Senator Johnson's basic concept but I don't think that rests on whether or not we relieve this pressure area or not. I think that study can come and maybe a total revamping may, in fact, be in order. I do not know that but I think we can rest assured and be relatively certain that the need is there now and that to keep these cases processed we are going to have to give them the help. Now how many times have we heard in this body the judiciary not having the manpower to process the cases, a backlog of things being delayed. We have heard it a lot of times, time and time again from constituents, from news accounts across this state. So I think in order to act responsible when the cry comes, we can't put our head in the sand. We have got to solve the problem and so I strongly urge that we support this bill.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Lamb.

SENATOR LAMB: Mr. President and members, I am sorry I missed part of the debate but the reason this proposal to lay this over until next year was brought before you is twofold. In the first place, the Executive Board does have a study resolution, LR 103, which is on page 1797 of your Journal which calls for a study of judicial districts in the State of Nebraska. Secondly, you will remember that this body appropriated \$25,000 just the other day on LB 558 and that proposal, that record of that transaction was on page 1664 of the Journal. This body said that \$25,000 will be made available for an interim study of judicial districting in this state. I am merely saying, let's let the study become fact. The Judiciary Committee will make a study this summer. This money will be used for that purpose. I think it behooves us to wait on the results of this study before we go ahead adding a judge in this county. So with that in mind, those are the reasons that I ask that the bill be laid over. Our first thought was that the bill should be indefinitely postponed, that the enacting clause should be stricken. However, I think that this is a much better solution, that the bill be merely delayed until the next session when the study will be completed and we will have a better idea of where we should go with the redistricting problem on judicial areas.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, this is a very difficult question for, at least some of the