

April 6, 1992

LB 1059, 1237

will not achieve what you have been told they will achieve here. I think they will create additional inequities and costs, that they will adversely affect the judicial retention system and that there is simply not at base a good idea or a good policy for the state. Even though there are, as I noted, some inconsistencies between LB 1237 as it is currently on file and LB 1059 which we have just advanced, I will ask you to advance LB 1237 because in part it is not incompatible and I believe in part at least submits to you a system and a proposal for a continuing evaluation of the judicial system which we very badly need.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Wickersham. I do have a priority motion on the desk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Withem would move to bracket LB 1237 until April 20, 1992.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, members of the body, this is not a motion that is made out of malice towards this particular bill. It just has more to do with the agenda and the spot in which we find ourselves. We now have the remainder of today, however long that may last, and tomorrow to consider bills on General File. This bill, if it stays before us, is likely to take a considerable length of time for a discussion. We have now advanced a bill dealing with judicial redistricting onto Select File. If Senator Wickersham wishes, when that bill comes around on Select File, to amend into it the concept of the Judicial Resources Commission, he'll be able to do that on Select File. He will, if he wants to between now and Select File, convince a majority of the members of the body that we erred in advancing 1059 and his approach of creation of the judicial districts is the proper one, he'll have an ability to do that. It's just that we now have the vehicle onto Select File and our time is very precious at this point and we have a number of other pieces of legislation before us that need a shot, need a discussion. His ideas and his thoughts are still very much alive. I, you know, very much as a matter of fact appreciated hearing his discussion about perhaps reconstituting Judicial Resources District as a body giving recommendations to the Legislature. I think that is an excellent approach and I would probably support that if it were not tied with creation of the existing districts. So the bracket motion is not a motion