

April 6, 1992

LB 1059, 1237

SENATOR CONWAY: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Anyone wishing to speak to the Beutler amendment? Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Thank you, Mr. President. Just briefly, I plan to vote for this amendment, even though, as you'll hear later, I'm very much opposed to 1059 as a matter of principle and for what it does to the judicial system in the State of Nebraska at the district court level. I am willing to vote for this amendment simply because, if we should happen to pass 1059, it contains one idea that you'll also find in 1237 and one that I feel very strongly about, and that is if you're going to have judges, you need to make sure that we don't concentrate them in specific areas of the state. And that would be a particular problem with large judicial districts. So, if we should happen to have large judicial districts by some stroke of fate, or whatever else moves this body, then we do need to give the Supreme Court a mechanism for distributing those judges across the district so that they offer services to the people. So, for that reason, I'll support the amendment, not because I support the principles of 10...what's embodied in the balance of 1059.

SENATOR CONWAY: Thank you, Senator Wickersham. Senator Withem, your light is on, but it was on for the mainline. Waive off. Senator Lynch, would you like to speak to the amendment? Senator Lynch. I don't see Senator Lynch, so would you like to close, Senator Beutler?

SENATOR BEUTLER: (Response inaudible.)

SENATOR CONWAY: Senator Beutler waives closing. The question is the adoption of the Beutler amendment to LB 1059. All in favor signify by voting aye, and opposed nay.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of Senator Beutler's amendment.

SENATOR CONWAY: The Beutler amendment is adopted. Now back to the bill. Senator Withem, we're back to the bill now.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, Mr. Chair, members of the body, I rise in support of LB 1059, not just out of habit of supporting the number LB 1059, but because this also, I think, is a good bill. It was an amendment that I offered, last year, that got us in the position in which we are in, and that is when we were going