

the same as what would occur with this particular amendment. I assume that if we even changed it in a manner that said if one of the individuals involved in the appeal chose to hear the case before the nine-judge panel, I would assume that all members, all cases would be heard before that nine-judge panel. It's a nice idea. I don't think anyone really wants to be forced into the situation of having to deal with a Supreme Court problem and the backlog that we have seen in recent years, but society demands quick decisions. Society demands that we no longer have a two-year delay in those appeals, and if you've seen their estimates as to filings into the future, they are going up. They are not going down. We have more and more litigation in society.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Time.

SENATOR ABBOUD: Just as we have more and more lawyers, we have more and more litigation and we have to deal with this problem somewhere down the road. And one final remark is that in dealing with this problem, if we have nine judges...

SPEAKER BARRETT: I'm sorry.

SENATOR ABBOUD: ...we're going to have the problem...

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Abboud, I'm sorry, time has expired.

SENATOR ABBOUD: Okay, thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Amendment on the desk, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Lindsay would move to amend his own amendment. (Lindsay amendment to the amendment appears on page 282 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER BARRETT: The Chair recognizes Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body, this amendment was brought to me by, actually Senator Chambers pointed out an error in the drafting and it's intended to correct something that I had intended to put in when we originally drafted it. The amendment is as follows and in your Journals on page 246, line 20, at the top it adds after "Legislature", "or capital cases" and down further on line 12, where it says "constitutionality of a statute" it adds "or