

rehearing. But, before it gets to that point, the Supreme Court can look at the files, the record and the recommendation of this three-judge panel. That is going to take time. They want to get away from having to make reviews. They're going to review the additional documents produced by this additional level of judicial bureaucracy. So instead of having you go from district court to the Supreme Court and they make a final decision, you create an additional layer and you pass through that layer. Then what that layer does is reviewed by the Supreme Court itself. Twice chewed cud goes through the Supreme Court and then, if the Supreme Court, because they say they're so busy, do a slipshod job of reviewing, and the losing litigant recognizes that, he or she can make a motion for a new...a rehearing before the Supreme Court. You can prepare a brief in support of your position. The Supreme Court may determine that the panel did not reach a decision that should be a definitive statement of the law. And that happened not too long ago with reference to a decision one of these panels made on a medical malpractice case. So the law then is put in a state of uncertainty. You win at the district court level. The other side appeals.

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So you go through this appellate level, and you win again. And the other side, who lost, then files for a rehearing and you, who have won, have to take another step. If you've hired a lawyer, you've got to pay that lawyer for an additional bit of work, so it's going to employ lawyers also, and they try to give the impression that this is designed to help the public and the litigants, but it's really an employment bill for retired judges and lawyers. That's not the way it's presented, but I would like those who defend this bill to counteract what I say and, first of all, show that it does not create another step which must, itself, be reviewed by the Supreme Court and also that it does not require the litigants, if they want to get all the way to the Supreme Court, that it does not require them to hire lawyers for an additional step of work that they must pay for, which is not the case under the current system. But, on this particular amendment, I support it.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Ashford.

SENATOR ASHFORD: On the bill.