

remember that over a period of time the complexity of cases is going to work out in some kind of rough balance, or, if you're going to argue that it doesn't work out in some kind of rough balance, I think the argument would be that in the commercial sectors of our state, Omaha specifically, they probably have more complex commercial litigation in those areas, so therefore, if anything, the statistics, with regard to the complexity factor, are probably showing not as much a discrepancy between Omaha and some of the other districts as actually exist.

SENATOR CROSBY: Okay, thank you. I think that for people who do not...who are not lawyers the only difficulty we have is understanding the law side of it, perhaps. But we can see the work load and caseload problem. We can see the idea of changing, or combining, or adding to Omaha, for instance, where they seem to have a lot more cases. The trigger word here seems to be redistricting. And I think we're all so nervous and tense right now about redistricting that the minute that that word comes up we start getting more tense. But thank you for clarifying, that's all I wanted. I don't have any big statement to make. If I have any time left, Madam President, do I have any time left?

PRESIDENT MOUL: Two minutes.

SENATOR CROSBY: Would you like to have that, Senator Beutler?

SENATOR BEUTLER: No, that's fine, Senator Crosby. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Okay. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Crosby. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President and members of the Legislature, I have to say again that those who support 181 and are opposed to Senator Beutler's amendment all of a sudden cannot accept the caseload argument as a justification for accepting his amendment. Accept the caseload argument in order to redistribute these judges where the caseload is found. These are the same people who, on the appellate court, argued me into the ground saying, look at the caseload of the Supreme Court. I talked about the absence of complexity from a lot of the cases, it got nowhere. I see dishonesty on this floor, or I see stupidity. Either there was stupidity in accepting the caseload argument for the appellate court, or there is stupidity in