

January 31, 1990

LB 942

LR 8

that direction and guidance will not be there. So you will have one type of justice in one part of the state, another type of justice in another part of the state and you won't know why because the judges are not required to write their opinions. Farmer Brown was unfairly ruled against in the district court, so we reverse and Farmer Brown wins.

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Farmer Smith, on the other side of the line, sitting before...coming before another panel, fails, and yet his or her case was what the lawyers say was on all fours with Farmer Brown's case before the other panel. There is a conflict. Which one should go to the Supreme Court, which one should be considered right? There is nothing in this constitutional amendment to deal with that. There is nothing in LB 942, that bill before the Judiciary Committee, to deal with that. Everybody wants to say we'll put these matters off until a future date, which means they will never be dealt with. So my amendment would call these courts what they are, the top court is the "big-shot" court, the peon's court for the insignificant, unimportant citizens would be the "peon" court. And I mean these...I'm offering this amendment very seriously and I hope you will vote in the affirmative for it.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Chambers, there are no other lights on, would you care to make a close, please.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes, I would. And I'm not going to turn my light on to speak again, because I know the dye is cast and I know what's going to happen with this proposed constitutional amendment. But I find it so abhorrent, I find it so distasteful that it has been difficult for me to resist the temptation to do all I can to keep it from getting on the ballot. But in view of the fact that we've had a chance to get certain things into the record, I want it, if it gets on the ballot, to go with a record of those who voted to put it there. Those who went on record saying, by their vote, being, as the lawyers say again, well informed in the premises, or something like that, to take away the rights that citizens currently enjoy under the Constitution. And I'm going to bring this up from time to time during the session when other bills are brought that are designed to look out for the interests of certain economic groups and others who have power in this state. And I'm going to watch the political posturing as people talk about the rights of the people needing