

have been paid for at the local level in an attempt to approve the efficiency of the court. I would applaud the local jurisdictions for being willing to undertake that burden but nonetheless it does impact the operations of the court and I think it's appropriate for us to take that into consideration when we decide how to allocate judicial resources across the state. Now, I don't believe that it is appropriate that we would have law clerks or a single judge, for example, sitting in Alliance. I don't think it's necessary that we have a court administrator for a single judge sitting in Alliance. I think that, in itself, would become inefficient and I think that's been recognized as inefficient by the system because they aren't there. But when you have larger courts those things can become efficient and they can be provided by the local jurisdictions, but they do affect what the judges do, the amount of time that they have to spend on those ancillary items and they affect the ability of the judges to decide cases. So I think there's no way to avoid taking those things into consideration and I would merely suggest that what we have to find is a way to equitably take into consideration those items, not that we ignore them. You know, how they should be properly weighted, how they should be properly counted in the system, that remains to be seen. I'm willing to wait for recommendations on that matter. I don't consider myself to be an expert on that kind of an analysis but that doesn't mean that it shouldn't be done and that doesn't mean that it wouldn't be beneficial to this body. The underlying tenor of Senator Withem's amendment to the amendment is not at all disturbing to me. I'm not sure it's necessary but it doesn't...it doesn't hurt anything and if it would prompt some greater creativity and the production of additional thought from the Judicial Resources Commission, I would certainly have no objection to that. So, however the body chooses to vote on Senator Withem's amendment to the amendment I don't think it's...it isn't objectionable, it addresses an issue that we never intended this to be a limiting list, in the first place, but if there's some ambiguity about that, the amendment is fine.

**PRESIDENT ROBAK:** Thank you, Senator Wickersham. Senator Brashear.

**SENATOR BRASHEAR:** Madam President, members of the Legislature, I rise in support also of the Withem amendment for the reason that if it's not necessary, it certainly is not...is not harmful. The listing that is set forth in the amendment was designed to take us beyond where we are today, some of which I,