

that should be the case. I don't think the Constitution should deny people those rights. On the one hand he says, don't guarantee the right to an appeal in felony cases in the Constitution, but deny the right of appeal to the Supreme Court in the Constitution for others. They want it both ways and you expect that from lawyers, but that doesn't mean that we who are not lawyers or those who may be trained in the law but nevertheless have a concern for the citizens should go along with that. People have no idea of what damage is done to their rights in these legislative proceedings. And I say again, there are going to be farmers in a distressed economy in days to come and they're going to get what they feel was a raw deal in the lower court and when they appeal to the Supreme Court and find out they don't have an appeal there, that's the time that all of that heat is going to be generated and they're going to talk about the no good courts, the no good judges, the no good Legislature presided over by lawyers who are in league against the rights of citizens because they do not know and they are not aware that the work being done right now by this Legislature is aimed at taking away a right that they have had ever since this has been a state. You are not going to hurt the judicial system by guaranteeing the right for appeal in criminal cases. Neither Senator Kristensen, nor the Chief Justice or anybody else who testified on that proposed bill that we have before us that would set up this kangaroo court was able to tell how conflicts between these panels would be resolved. They say, well maybe we can work something out, maybe we can deal with that. Everything is maybe and perhaps, but the reality is right now they have...

PRESIDENT: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...one of these appellate courts. They have...they follow precedent in the American judicial system. The opinions of yesterday give guidance for the opinions that will be issued today and tomorrow and in the future. They point out how courts construe statutes and there will be construction of statutes by these appellate panels, but since their opinions don't have to be published, there is no guidance, there is no precedential value, none of the things that undergird the system as it exists now. And the lawyers go along with it because the judges before whom they will appear say that this is what they want. This is an argument against the unholy alliance that exists between practicing lawyers and the judicial system by virtue of mandatory membership in the Bar Association. They control what is happening in the area where they all make their