

come back without ever having service. So I don't think that's going to correct the problem that it's attempting to correct. And I guess, lastly, I would point out that I don't believe uniformity is always the best reason to change something. As Senator Ashford pointed out, the differences are intentional, the differences between county court and district court, because they have two different purposes. I don't believe making the two courts uniform, and this will certainly not make the two courts uniform, the discover rules still differ between the two courts as do some of the other procedures, and I don't believe uniformity is always the best choice. And, again, I would urge that the bill not be advanced.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator McFarland, further discussion.

SENATOR MCFARLAND: Thank you, Mr. President. Two points. If the idea is that you're going to get a default judgment in 20 days, I don't think that it makes very much difference of getting a default judgment in 30 days. If a defendant has not responded within the 20-day period, it's unlikely that he or she or it will respond within the 30-day period as well. So I don't think waiting an additional 10 days is a significant burden on a plaintiff bringing a cause of action in county court. The other point is that if, in fact, you're talking about expediting the legal procedures, I mean, it would make just as much sense to take the district court and make their answer period only 20 days instead of 30 days as it is. I think if we're going to have some consistency, it makes very good sense to have it consistent as far as the answer date period between the district court and the county court and, for that reason, I think it is a minor change. I don't think it would have any significant impact at all. We're really talking about matters of philosophy here rather than any matter of any practical effect. I think it's a fairly simple bill. It's more of a housekeeping bill and would be a good bill to pass. And as far as whether it's a lawyer's bill or not, I know some members get all concerned about that thinking, oh, this is a lawyer's bill and, therefore, they vote against it or for it or whatever. It's really neither one. As you can see, there are a number of lawyers on this floor, some of them are urging its passage, others are raising questions about it. I don't think it's...whether it's a lawyer's bill or not, I don't think you can categorize it one way or the other. It is simply a matter of whether you want to have a uniform provision in both...that would apply both to the