

judicial branch of government. And I'm a strong supporter of the judicial branch of government but notwithstanding that I think we have a pretty good idea...we should have a pretty good idea of how those resources are being used and are they being used in the most efficient manner possible. You can come in with an amendment like this which at least ostensibly seeks to do that and that's a good idea, but when we put in a laundry list provision, et al, I think that it's limiting usually rather than enveloping more information. In particular, I have problems with a portion of that that wants to evaluate the impact on the judicial workload of the following personnel, which would be law clerks, administrative assistants, referees, bailiffs, clerk magistrates, etcetera, other personnel. And what it is, it's a shot that's designed for some of the more populated counties which do have law clerks and referees and court administrators and those types of personnel funded by the counties. Those...they are enhancing the effectiveness of their judges by providing lower paid staff to do some of the things that otherwise they would have to do or would be done in other counties. The fear I have is that a county then would have an incentive to not provide adequate support for their judge because if those things aren't around, it looks better, their judge is busier, their judge has more to do, which is exactly, exactly the argument we hear in opposition to an reallocation resources is you can't compare the Panhandle to Douglas County because Douglas County has referees. Douglas County has a court administrator. Douglas County has other support staff. That's a good thing. We shouldn't have an 80,000 dollar a year judge filling out forms that could be filled out by someone who is making 18 or 20,000 dollars a year. It's not an efficient utilization of resources, and yet the incentive by taking that into consideration in reallocation resources is if you want a good number of judges which it gets into the other argument that we hear that it's economic development for the local areas, if you want a decent amount of judges, get rid of those support staffs, get rid of those referees in Douglas County because then your workload goes up on the judges and you can get more judges into your county. Rather, the opposite we ought to be including in here is the question of whether counties ought to be required to provide efficient support staff, or, on the other end, whether the state ought to start picking up the tab to provide support staff equitably around the state because if that's done then our judges will be more efficient. We won't need as many judges. We can use lower paid staff to do some of the functions that judges are doing. But I do have a problem with the way