

Court of Appeals is going to have to come out to the various judicial districts. That's already in the bill. And the way it's worded is that as practical as can be, with consideration given to the convenience of the parties, the court will come out and travel, the court will hear cases. But to mandate that they should meet and hear the cases in the Supreme Court district of what they were decided, they may wait even longer to get enough cases to make it worth their time to come out to. And so, in fact, it could have the exact opposite effect. It also would cost a fortune, if you're going to continue to have these people travel. Senator Beutler had an amendment that he has withdrawn, basically because I do have the same thing, and that is to reduce this court on numbers. Is it going to work as well? No. Do we have to take our turn at lower revenues in the state and thus cut the costs down? Yes, I'm willing to do that. But, if we're going to cut the number of judges down, that also makes amendments like this very dangerous because you're going to defeat the entire purpose of having the Appeals Court, and then you're going to have them running all over the state just for the purpose of saying, well, they're going to be there. It's going to hurt the effectiveness of the court greatly, it's going to cost tremendous amounts of money just to have them travel all over just to be in that one Supreme Court district. And the best thing I can talk to you about is the purpose of the Appeals Court is to help the backlog, is to do those things. Should the court come out, in outstate Nebraska, and sit and hear cases? Should it go to Omaha and hear cases? Absolutely, and that's already in the bill. But to mandate that they must decide those cases in the judicial district where the decision was rendered is going to be astronomical, plus we're going to cut the number of judges down. They're going to spend most of their time driving, just to meet this mandate, it's going to cut down their effectiveness, it's going to cut down the number of appears that they can hear, and, quite frankly, in a number of these districts they're going to wait even longer, until you get enough of these cases to make it worthwhile for them to go out there. So, with that, I would strenuously urge that we not adopt this amendment. And I think the bill we addressed... , Senator Haberman, I, too, looked at that. I don't want the court merely to sit in Lincoln and force everybody to come to them. At the same time, I can't have them out there riding the circuit, because that is not their purpose, they're not a trial court, they're an appellate court. And so the convenience of the parties will still be there, I think that we adequately deal with it, and I would object to this amendment. Thank you.