

March 21, 1979

LB 237

are going to do by doing this is we are going to avoid an issue which this Legislature is going to have to face. Five years of practice is not unreasonable to an attorney if you are really going to know the law. I don't care if you have had the professional training experience but the five years of practice appears to me is so that you have some idea of what the law is totally about and how to make a determination. Three years of practice, why not just put it one year of practice and have the young man become a judge then?

SENATOR HABERMAN: I will support that amendment, Senator Koch.

SENATOR KOCH: You will? I can't support that amendment because I don't believe you are going to help the legal system or the judicial system by doing this. In fact, you may indeed be doing harm to the citizens and residents of those counties.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The Chair recognizes Senator Reutzel.

SENATOR REUTZEL: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I rise in opposition to the Haberman amendment and can only echo what Senator Koch has just stated. The emphasis should be on the quality of the person seeking a judgeship and not on the quantity. Quality is what we are after when we go before the board, when we go before a judge and go to a courtroom. We want to have the most capable person we can have up there. We want to have someone who understands the law, who appreciates the law, someone who has had some experience as being a trial attorney and someone who understands the process, not someone who just came out of law school and, Senator Haberman, I find it hard to understand how someone can be twenty five years old and have three years of practice since you have got to go to four years of college and three years of law school. That makes it very tough to be twenty five years old and have three years of law practice in order to qualify under your amendment and that is just one more reason I oppose the Haberman amendment to 237.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Stoney.

SENATOR STONEY: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I, too, rise in opposition to the Haberman amendment. If you will look at the intent and the thrust of this bill it is to improve and enhance the qualifications of individuals that would serve in this capacity and I think with the guidelines