

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

April 13, 1999 LB 729

side would say, see there, the ones who opposed it even had to agree. This is constitutional, it doesn't violate the law, the court said so and the opponents said so, then there is all this battling back and forth over what a decision by a court really means. So let us say that the court agrees with the Secretary of State, and says it shouldn't be on the ballot. I'd like to ask Senator Schimek a question. Senator Schimek, may I ask you a question? I'm not going to...

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Certainly.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'm not going to take you through that scintillating scenario that I laid out but I will tell you enough to ask this question. The Secretary of State has rejected an offering. It is taken to court by somebody to challenge his ruling and the court upholds the Secretary of State's ruling. Does the person then, who brought this court challenge, have the right to take it to the appellate court?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And if the appellate court upholds...

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...the lower court, then the person can take it to the Supreme Court.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: I would presume so, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And all of this will be done before the time that the deadline would be past for placing something on the ballot.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, but remember, Senator Chambers, this takes place pretty early in the process.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But we cannot force the courts to rule in the time we say they should, that is a violation of the separation of powers.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Right.