

challenging the constitutionality of a statute. Aside from that, and it is going to take a little time to try to get some of this into the record, so that is why I am starting on the committee amendment, the bill, which is an amendment to the Constitution proposal, would create an appellate court composed of, I believe, three...nine judges. Instead of being able to appeal to the Supreme Court as a matter of right, you have a right only to go to that appellate court, which would be created, and it will not sit as a nine judge court. It will divide itself into three groups, so you don't even get an appeal before the entire appellate court but one-third of it. We have to consider what we are doing here. What we are doing is proposing a trade-off, and this is what the trade-off consists of: Providing more convenience to the Supreme Court by cutting down the right of citizens to appeal in exchange for taking away the right of citizens to appeal to the Supreme Court. Everybody wants to have less work and continue to get the same pay, but when it comes to the resolution of problems that develop in a society, the court system is the one that has been established for that purpose in this state. Even though a person convicted of a capital offense would have an absolute right to appeal that matter to the State Supreme Court, there are lesser degrees of homicide. There are second degree murder, manslaughter. These crimes carry up to life imprisonment. A person convicted of a crime does not have a guaranteed right to appeal that to the State Supreme Court. I think anybody who has a serious matter, whether it is being convicted of a serious crime, or if the matter involves a substantial civil matter, those people should have a right to an appeal to the State Supreme Court. When the judges talk about their work load and how difficult it is to resolve these appeals, it should be kept in mind that this is not a manufacturing state where you might have complex antitrust cases in violation of a state law that must be resolved. There are no esoteric or complicated issues of such a volume as to take a lot of the court's time. Many of the matters are fairly routine. I don't think the court...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...can make a case on the basis of their work load that would justify taking away a basic right that citizens have had from the beginning of the judicial system in this state. I hope you will carefully review this proposal, and I hope you will defeat it. I am going to vote against the committee amendment, because if I were to vote for the committee