

PRESIDENT: One minute.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: ...separate systems. They like the collegiality of having one body that hears all the cases and keeps the common law in this state in a succinct pattern. In other words, you don't have two courts doing two separate things in two separate areas.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Okay, we may have to discuss that a little further here privately because I think I see layers being set up here also, so, thank you.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Chambers, you're next, but may I introduce a couple of guests of Senator Bernard-Stevens. We have Bill Boone and Marty Peterson from North Platte under the north balcony. Would you folks please stand and be recognized. Thank you. Senator Chambers, followed by Senator Kristensen and Senator Korshoj.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, the purpose of a Constitution is to restrain government. The purpose of a state Constitution is to restrain the Legislature. Senator Kristensen wants to talk about what we can do through statute. He says that we can include felony appeals statutorily. If there is such a backlog caused by criminal cases, felony appeals now, won't the same argument be made if I try to get a statutory requirement that there be appeals for felonies? Well, no, the backlog is too great. That's why Senator Kristensen does not want this in the Constitution. He says it's the backlog. If that is the reason to deny an appeal to the Supreme Court in the Constitution, that set of circumstances will not be changed simply because I'll try to do it statutorily. He is saying there are two paths which you can take, the Constitution or the statute, but his ultimate argument says that the same barrier will be placed across both paths and that barrier will be this so-called backlog. The criminal docket is not that far behind and he knows it and everybody else who is familiar with this situation knows it. And Senator Kristensen did not completely reflect what I'm doing because he said my amendment puts us right back where we were. No. His proposal in LR 8 takes away the right to appeal civil cases based on a constitutional assurance. I'm not changing that. I'm leaving in his language that says all other criminal and civil matters will be appealed to that appellate court. You're not entitled to an appeal to the Supreme Court and I don't think