

is designed only for the most minor instances and I see no point in having a public reprimand when the entire thing can be handled in fifteen or twenty minutes, or thirty minutes with the Supreme Court or with the Chief Justice in his chambers. I see no reason to air that publicly when it can be handled on a relatively small plane and I would oppose the Vickers amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislature, my comments are going to be addressed to the comments made by the lawyers and not by Senator Reutzel because the lawyers are practitioners. The lawyers know that there is a presiding judge in these various jurisdictions and at these various levels. If the Supreme Court is not moving cases, the Chief Justice is to see that something is done. The presiding judge of the municipal court or of the district court would have the same responsibility and obligation. If cases are not being moved, then there should be a public reprimand if the situation has deteriorated to such an extent that the presiding judge cannot control the situation nor the Chief Justice at the Supreme Court level. We are not talking about failure to move case loads. The lawyers again had to reach out and find a situation which nobody is really contemplating as a subject for consideration by the commission. We are talking about conduct by a judge that could be prejudicial to the administration of justice and we know that if a new judge is on the bench, nobody is going to feel that he or she should be reprimanded for not functioning at the level of efficiency of a judge who has been there for a thousand years. What we are talking about is improper conduct. This is the escape hatch. This doesn't say that in a very minor situation the judge is going to be subjected to a private reprimand. It could mean that if a judge is engaged in conduct so notorious that everybody knows the commission will have a hearing and the public will know that something is being considered but then no finding is brought out, but let's say that this judge has influence and friends. Let's say he is a drunk like the former Chief Justice of the State Supreme Court was and to my knowledge I am the only one who will publicly take issue with it, the court making rulings taking other people's drivers license for driving drunk and here the Chief Justice was a drunk and it was known. The Chairman of the Board of Parole the same thing, had his license lifted because he is a drunk but we don't want to deal with these people in these high place positions. We want