

take some of your cases. Other states, the appellate court has risen tremendously. So as I stated before and I'll state again, this amendment, the second part that we're discussing, guarantees that we're going to get more judges as there's going to be more cases filed. Why don't we turn it around the other way and have the proposal come to us, we have these many cases; our caseload is 150 percent or 150 cases over what we've had for the past two years, we need two more judges. Then let this body authorize two more judges. We're doing this just the wrong way as far as I'm concerned. If we were in private business or even running the state government, would we say that you can buy two new automobiles or buy a new building if this happens? No, we'd say when it happens, then we will judge, appropriate and go about our business to change the system, to change the business so that it will help us. I would much prefer to do it the other way around, that they come back to us and say, our caseload is very heavy, it has increased a certain percent, we need additional judges, would you please give them to us. That would be the logical and common sense way to approach this problem. Therefore, I object and I oppose the Kristensen amendment, the second part, as divided by Senator Beutler. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BAACK PRESIDING

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Haberman. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President and members, I rise in support of Senator Beutler's motion to strike this portion of the Kristensen amendment. The proposal, and I think I voted for the appeals court bill when it went through here, I didn't speak to it but I voted for it and didn't really understand why and I clearly understand now that six is enough. Just looking at it from the perspective of some of the arguments that have been made in support of it, the question isn't whether or not there's an appeals court. It's true the people have voted on it. You have a Supreme Court right now that handles all this material and their makeup is seven. With the first portion of the Kristensen amendment, you reduce it to six. You virtually double the number of justices that have the ability to hear these cases and if you split those into two panels of three, one could argue that you have three times the opportunities or three times the number of folks that had that ability prior to the people speaking. Nine is, I just think, excessive and this provision, the second half of the Kristensen amendment which