

March 24, 1981

LB 475

SENATOR HABERMAN: Thank you. I rise to support Senator Chambers as if you will recall, fellow legislators, when an attorney is disbarred and sometimes they are disbarred for things that are less than a felony, nobody guarantees any income for him. They just absolutely wipe out his income, absolutely, totally wipe it out. They take away his livelihood no matter if he had one children or a dozen children so I feel that the same thing should pertain to judges and I will support Senator Chambers in his motion to return the bill and change it. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, I strongly oppose the amendment and I guess the only more shocking thing than the amendment is maybe where the amendment came from. There has been no person probably in the eleven years I have been here that stood on this floor and talks about the rights of the individual, innocent until proven guilty, etc., etc., etc. Now what is Senator Chambers proposing to do? Judges are different. Judges, the moment there is even an indictment rendered or anything, he is ready to wipe them out. Judge Jones through circumstances, let's say, receives an indictment and now you wipe out his family income. You destroy him completely. I guess I just really have difficulty understanding this new approach of Senator Chambers, one standard for one class, you know, but a certainly different standard for the other, if you just happen to be a judge. And I would use a little example and we will call it a hypothetical, but I think I don't need to talk too long before you figure out what I am talking about. There was a case, let's call it Mr. X, not too long ago and he got a bunch of felony indictments. Let's just say for the purpose of discussion that he was a sheriff. Ultimately he was acquitted of everything. Let's say it happened over in "Sarpinion" County. A simple case like that would have completely destroyed this individual if you applied those standards. I think the language has been pretty carefully drafted. You are putting jurisdiction and control on the Supreme Court and I just guess I think you better not be adopting a different kind of approach on judges in our criminal justice system than you do on everybody else and basically you are saying, hey, the moment anybody makes an accusation for all practical purposes, the moment anybody tries to say anything, we are going to wipe you out. I oppose the amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Dworak.

SENATOR DWORAK: Mr. President, I was questioning this amendment based on the language that was on the ballot and I think