

the backlog is terrible, Senator Kristensen informs me that at some point...at this point it takes anywhere from 20 to 24 months for a case to be heard on the Supreme Court, and that is too long. And I hear all of those things and people will say, yes, we need to do something we have to do something. And I agree, we need to do something. The problem I have with LB 586 is I'm not sure that again we're not being put into a position where, yes, we need to do something. This is the only thing we have, therefore, it's either this or nothing. And so the Legislature will once again do, as we've done in the past, while we need to do something, this is all we've got, we'll pass it, even though this bill may not actually solve the problem, it may in fact create a larger problem. And I think we should look at it very closely. The question that I have in my mind on 586 is some of the areas Senator Chambers touched on earlier, is I have a sneaking suspicion that we may be approaching the problem from the wrong end. We have an increase in cases being appealed. We're not solving that problem, we're not trying to reduce those particular cases, necessarily. Those appeals will go on, and people want to have their day in court in the Supreme Court. They want to have that final decision. Senator Kristensen is absolutely right, we do not have the right, nor should we take their day in the Supreme Court, if they so desire. My concern comes with the person or the individual or the entity that is trying to win a case and they do not have proper funds, they do not have the adequate financial resources and they're competing against a foe, if you wish, that does. What we're doing in this particular case is setting up an intermediate type of situation where a decision will be...or, excuse me, a recommendation will be made and that recommendation, even if it favored the individual with less funds, with less financial funds, it still would be appealed to the Supreme Court. And I fail to see, at this particular point, how this interim procedure will correct that. I also foresee a possibility that if the Judiciary Committee, and if Senator Kristensen and others come up with a bill, a long-term, solid reform on reducing the case log, if it's another intermediate court, I suspect we may have the same problem. I suspect that what we'll have is the same number of courts or cases being appealed, but now since we have another case, another court that is going to be able to help reduce the case load, it may, in fact, encourage more people to appeal even further. So we may have an additional number of appeals and we still have the same problem, but now we have two areas that are being backlogged. I do have some serious concerns upon...about that particular matter. The other concern that I have is the