

there is any fiscal note required until this last amendment which was not adopted may have. There shouldn't be any that I am aware of.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Well, I noticed in one of the amendments that was adopted that we are going to be paying all of the expenses of the commission on the judicial workload and they are going to meet in Lincoln. Now, would that or would that not call for a fiscal note?

SENATOR WARNER: Which amendment is that, Senator Haberman?

SENATOR HABERMAN: That is amendment, May 8, 1985, amendment number AMO214 by Senator Beutler.

SENATOR WARNER: Was it adopted?

SENATOR HABERMAN: I'm sure it was.

SENATOR WARNER: Then if it was adopted, it would have been included. If there was a cost to that, additional cost to that, it would have been provided in the fiscal note review that occurred last November. So I will...

SENATOR HABERMAN: Never mind, Senator Warner, I'm on the wrong bill.

SENATOR WARNER: That clears that up.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Hoagland, please.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: I would like to support Senator Warner's amendment, colleagues. I think it is a good idea, principally, because it reorganizes the probation administration structure in a rational more efficient way. Instead of having the chief probation officer, the state chief probation officer reporting to this committee consisting principally of judges that has him report to the court administrator's office within the structure of the judicial branch. Because the amendment does that and because it sunsets the current commission after two years, it also folds the district court budget into the budget for the Supreme Court and the county court, which will also assist the Appropriations Committee and the court system in budgeting for the courts. For those two reasons, it is a sensible, rational change, as Senator Warner indicated,