

CLERK: 26 ayes, 1 nay to cease debate, Mr. President.

SENATOR CLARK: Debate is ceased. Senator Chambers, do you wish to close?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I don't know why somebody as learned in the law and politics as Senator DeCamp would make the kind of statements he made other than because he is trying to make a point to the Supreme Court judges. This bill is not the one on which to make that point. The idea is that court costs should be what the term indicates, go toward the cost of administering the courts. Senator Kahle's comment is totally irrelevant because maintaining that Law Enforcement Training Center has nothing whatsoever to do with the operation or administration of the court. They are two different entities. The Law Enforcement Training Center was created by statute. It ought to be funded by means of an appropriation as every other state agency. You don't say that somebody may get upset with the Department of Insurance and, therefore, the Appropriations Committee may not give them the money it takes to operate so let's start earmarking a certain amount from every premium paid to support the Department of Insurance. That is not done with the State Patrol which is a law enforcement agency. You don't say, Senator Kahle, and the rest of you and Senator DeCamp, earmark fifty cents from every traffic case that comes before the court and call it court costs and let that go to defray the cost of the State Patrol who are the ones who write the tickets, therefore they should be supported by those against whom they write the tickets. What you are really saying is that you want to give those who make judgements about whether people are guilty or innocent an interest in finding them guilty. The more people who are found guilty the more money there is that goes into a certain fund. People can say that a judge will not be influenced in his decision by the fact that a dollar from every guilty fine goes into his retirement fund but if such is not the case why are they so concerned if we knock that dollar off? That dollar does make a difference. One of the reasons they got rid of the justice of the peace system as I mentioned the other day was that in some cases it was like a bounty. The amount of compensation that JP got was determined by how many people were found guilty. So if you are going to make somebody's salary or some type of financial enrichment dependent on the outcome of a decision which he or she must make, then it is clear that the judgement can be influenced by that financial interest. I think the amendment is valid and for those who are concerned about a hearing, adopt the amendment and send the bill to the Judiciary Committee or