

the second part of the Kristensen amendment, the first thing that we're debating at this point on to divide the question. And, I guess, I'm going to be voting against that particular section for two reasons. Number one, I have always been intrigued with how we came up with three panels of three judges because we had this tremendous overload and this is what was going to solve it, but now all of a sudden we can go to two and three panels, excuse me, two panels of three judges and though it's not going to be quite as good, it's still acceptable and we do it on Select File rather than doing it through the amendment process in the bill, in the beginning, and I suspect what happened is that you go ahead and try for the magic number. You go for the Cadillac, you go for what you absolutely would like to have and, of course, you don't make the amendment on General File to lessen it to what we probably couldn't use, afford and could effectively handle the situation, we'll wait and that will be the compromise position at Select File, you know. And I understand the politics of it and I understand the procedure of doing it that way. The only thing that kind of shows that the process that they actually could have done two panels of three in the first place is because the bill is greased enough anyway that it was going. The bill would have gone. The only concern, the only reason that it was held back and this amendment is there is there became a concern for the budget, a concern that they might decide, we, the body, may decide that we can't afford to do this now so we're going to cut it back to about four to \$500,000 and only spend a little over a million dollars for it and, thus, we have the amendment. I suspect the amendment was ready at any time. If there was a problem, they would offer it, and I understand that, but I think we could have started out this way in the very beginning. However, the second part that talks about the expansion, one of the things that I would like to see personally is, is this process that we're going to do in LB 732 when it passes as amended, is it going to be effective, is it going to work? And I would hate to bind this body and Nebraskans into a somewhat automatic increase based on caseload or case filings until we understand a little bit better of how it is working or how it is not working, and there is plenty of time for the body to look at it and say, you know, Senator Kristensen and those that helped put together LB 732, that was a tremendous idea, it's really doing well and, in fact, we need to expand it to another court of three and it will even be better, when we have that knowledge and input. We can do that at any time, but I'd rather do it that way than mandate something, in essence, by a magical number, when we reach it we'll go ahead