

speech, or should I let you do it? Because I've heard it about four times, you're going to hear it. It's going to be Court of Appeals, Chapter 10, about Volume 8. But I'm going to let him do that. You'll get a chance to hear the Court of Appeals. But let's... Senator Avery, I need to correct you on several things. One is the Supreme Court. Your characterization that the Court of Appeals... what'd you say, it was a bad court, wasn't needed, was inferior? I don't know what your exact language... rather... rather loose with your terms and, of course, that's not what that opinion said and there is another forum in which we're going to visit about, whether it's this year or next year, about the value of precedential value of Court of Appeals' opinions. But to educate you about what occurred with the Court of Appeals and when that court came into being, realize that you had to wait over three years for your case to get heard. That's been drastically reduced today. And at the time we put the court in, there was a need for three panels of three and that that's what was needed in order to keep the backlog from growing, that's what was going to be needed to be done in order to give the Supreme Court the time to make opinions and to become basically our precedential court and to allow them the opportunity to concentrate on more major cases and give them time to contemplate them. Legislatures hate courts. Legislatures hate Supreme Courts badly because they tell them no. They say, I'm sorry, you have gone too far. There are not going to be popularity contests with the Legislature when it comes to the Supreme Court or the Court of Appeals. However, at the time, because of the money crunch that this state was going through, we reduced the panels and we took away an entire panel of three. At that time, we knew that for the sake of money we were going to cause ourselves some problems later because we didn't have a full court to take care of what the projections were in increased caseloads. That is beginning to come true today and so what we did was then was save money. We saved a little. We saved those three panels and gradually those caseloads are going to start to come back because it won't be enough judges. The policy choice is here. We could put in another three panel of judges to adequately staff the Court of Appeals. That's going to be significantly more than adding two law clerks and a staff attorney and, in effect, what this is doing is just getting us by in order to make the system run. If you talk to practicing attorneys out here, almost unanimously are they pleased with the workload of the Court of Appeals. But because that backlog is beginning to grow, they're having less