

periodically warrants it, even though it periodically warrants it. So what my amendment unadulterated says is that when the administration of justice requires a third judge to come in to handle the cases that are out there, then the Supreme Court Chief Justice or the district court, as the case may be, may take a county judge and have them serve temporarily as a juvenile court judge. Now let me ask you, in these times of fiscal conservatism, in these times of very finite state resources, what makes good sense? Doesn't it make good sense to use a person who has been called upon in hundreds and thousands of cases to make decisions that are life and death decisions, to let them serve temporarily in a juvenile court? Doesn't it make sense? It sure makes good dollar sense to me. That is all it does. It simply says that when the caseload becomes excessive, which it does periodically, that a county judge can be brought in to help with that caseload. Will children suffer as a result of that? I don't think so. I mean children today come before county judges. Children today come before county judges. So, too, do adults. So do criminals. So do civil defendants. So do probate matters. So do guardianships. So do adoptions. Lots of things come before county judges. Will children suffer if a county judge is brought in temporarily to relieve a caseload? Not in my book and I am a long time practitioner, not in my book. It is a cost-savings amendment. It may not be liked by some of the juvenile court judges because it may appear to be some kind of an encroachment upon turf or may not be, I don't know. I can't really question their motives but I can tell you what my motive is. My motive is this. Inasmuch as the state resources are very finite and we cannot appoint a third juvenile court judge in Omaha because of that, then we at least ought to give responsible judges the ability to appoint on a periodic basis as the caseload demands it, a county judge who can come in and deal with the overload. That is all it does. I think at this juncture if Senator Abboud's amendment is modified, I will not support it. All right. The first amendment I will support. The second one I will resist.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Withem, please.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, Mr. President, members of the body, I wonder if Senator Hoagland might respond to a question or two, and let me preface my question with the remark, what I am concerned with is the whole question of juvenile justice