

again, once again, the only thing the amendment does is to bring the recommendation of the Judicial Resources Commission back to the Legislature for final determination and there seems to be some confusion and I want to be sure that this is clear. Senator Bromm talked about the upper echelons of the work load statistics, that is I assume he means those that are the most worked, but those aren't affected by this amendment. This amendment affects as the Lindsay amendment affects the operations of the Judicial Resources Commission only with respect to the bottom half of the districts which are underworked. The only argument that has been made essentially against this amendment is the time lapse, that there is some concern that the vacancy may occur by an untimely death for example and it may be several months before it can be filled. I remind you again that we have districts that are operating in this state at almost half the work loads of other districts. Surely those districts can survive for a few months operating on the level that other judges at the top end of the scale operate on, surely, and if they can't, there are retired judges that can be brought in to assist for a temporary period of time. Assistance can be acquired from judges in other districts and several of those districts are underworked according to the caseload statistics. There ought to be no reason why they couldn't help out temporarily. In short, there are a number of mechanisms by which the system could adjust to meet a temporary problem, if there were a temporary problem, but there's not going to be a temporary problem because we're dealing with the districts that are underworked to begin with. I'm hoping some day I'll be surprised and this would be a nice day to be surprised because if you today decided you would like to make some changes, you could attach this amendment to the Lindsay amendment and you could be assured as long as judicial salaries remain in the amendment that reform would happen, reform would happen. And you can bet that they'd figure the system out if a little more pressure were put on the system, you can bet they would. But we don't put that pressure on them. We don't require what the taxpayer needs and that is some pressure for efficiency and when I come back around to this issue I understand again why the taxpayers are so upset with us. It's because we don't require efficiencies where we can in so many cases and we don't all agree when that should happen and when it shouldn't happen. But I would just ask you until somebody can explain the difference between the McCook district and the panhandle district to you, until somebody can really explain that to you, why don't you insist upon efficiency in this