

incompatible with LB 1059. However, there is a part of LB 1237 that is not incompatible with 1059 and I believe has a valid purpose and that is the portion of LB 1237 that sets up a Judicial Resources Commission. Now you heard a little bit of talk about that as we were debating LB 1059 and you heard some talk about the fact that we had it before and that the Bar Association destroyed it. Well of course, that wasn't true. The Bar Association did not destroy the Resources Commission, the Supreme Court did because they said it was an impermissible delegation of authority. LB 1237 puts back in place a Judicial Resources Commission composed of representatives from the Bar Association, from the courts and from the private citizens in each of the Supreme Court districts. The purpose of the commission is to advise the Legislature concerning the number of judges in both the county and district courts and also the boundaries of the districts. They are to report to us each year. They are to gather information and statistics and they are to make recommendations to us as they see fit and also each time there is a vacancy in the judicial system. I believe that that kind of a process is necessary and in addition we would direct the Resources Commission to consider factors other than the pure case loads that we had discussed in LB 1059. In addition to pure case loads it would ask the Judicial Resources Commission to weight those by category, to take into consideration adequate access to the courts, to take into account population, to take into account other judicial duties such as administration of the courts, to take into account travel time and to take into account other factors. In addition it would require the commission, each time there was a vacancy for any reason, whether it's resignation, death or removal, to hold hearings in the districts that would be affected so that we are assured of public input before any change would be made. The Judicial Resources Commission cannot act unilaterally. That's the message from the Supreme Court last year. The recommendations from the Resources Commission would have to come back to the Legislature for action. It would be up to us to adopt them, to reject them, to modify them, do as we see fit with them. There's a part of 1237 that is also compatible with LB 1059. In fact I was glad to see it pop up in LB 1059 and that is an authorization for the Supreme Court to designate a principal office and a preferred residence for a judge. Perhaps in that respect we could address the question of having an adequate dispersion of judicial resources across what you voted for in terms of these large districts which continue to concern me a great deal. I have a feeling that large judicial districts