

March 4, 1980

LB 82

proposition should be put to the public whose intent appears to be to protect judges who have been involved in wrongdoing. It is not a good trade off to say that because in the past you haven't been able to do anything to them you are going to do less than what ought to be done once you decide to deal with the issue. The Bar Association is made up of lawyers who must appear before judges. They are crippled in the beginning as far as trying to put in place a really worthwhile means of disciplining judges. If you vote the wrong way as a lawyer...we've had bills before the Judiciary Committee where lawyers have indicated they have been afraid to take certain positions, even on the judicial nominating commission because if the individual they voted against wound up being a judge they would run into trouble if they appeared before that judge and for this reason they want the deliberations of these commissions to be secret. If the lawyers are too vulnerable to put in place the type of law which is required, we as lawmakers have a higher obligation and responsibility. Some day I may be cursed to stand before a judge as a practicing attorney defending some hapless client. I have defended myself before judges but I am talking about some other individual and maybe the positions I take on the floor of the Legislature could make a difference there but these two propositions have to be kept separate. I don't think there is any justification. I don't think there is any justification for allowing a person who has pleaded guilty to a felony to continue to be known by the name of Judge. In the language on page 4 of the committee amendment where it mentions "a justice or judge pleading guilty or no contest to a felony", then I think that judge ought to immediately be removed. There could be an arguing point relative to one who goes to trial and is found guilty, not being removed until such time as that conviction becomes final. The judge who goes to trial is maintaining his or her innocence. A jury comes back with a finding of guilt. There may have been some error in the instructions, the type of evidence allowed or any of a number of things that could relate even to the merits of the case itself, so perhaps a suspension in that case until a final judgment comes in would be justified, but where a judge has pleaded guilty I see no basis for it and I would like to ask the Chair a question in terms of procedure. Mr. Chairman, because of the way the committee amendment is drafted and it puts the plea of guilt in the same breath with one who goes to trial, could I draft an amendment containing the sense of what I said which is that a judge