

in advance and that is what he is offering and then he is saying, and if they are successful somewhere along the line whether it be three months, six months, nine months, a year, two years, if they are successful in going through the gauntlet and winning and proving they did not do anything wrong, then we will say, okay, now we will give you your money. But remember there is something else about judges since you want them to be different. Judges only have one source of income. They can not be going out and doing a lot of other things. They are very limited. Now that is not to say they can't have investments and so on and so forth but the average judge is pretty well limited to getting an income from his job. Now, Joe Judge has a family. You see, judges are not that freakish. They have children, they have wives, they have houses and house payments and cars and car payments just like everybody else. They are humans and you want to say now suddenly because somebody accused them and you, Ernie Chambers, have seen more than anybody what damage can be done by a simple accusation. You want to say as soon as they are accused we will launch into them and deny them their income. How do they, then, survive during that period of time? I urge you to reject the amendments. I would submit one more thing, Senator Chambers. You said, why is the bill necessary? If it is in the Constitution, why is the bill necessary? I will tell you. Number one, read the bill. Do do that. It helps on a lot of bills here if you read them and you will discover that there were laws in existence before the constitutional amendment was passed and so now that the constitutional amendment is passed, we are bringing things into coordination with that. We are making corrections and codification there. So in a sense you can argue, no, the constitutional amendment is controlling. We do not need statutes. Why have a statute that says one thing, a constitutional amendment that says something else? We are merely coordinating them. I urge you simply to pass the bill. It was not that major a bill up until you decided to suspend the Constitution. I just don't think that is the right way to go, Senator Chambers, and I have a sneaking suspicion that you are playing us all for suckers here today, that you never intended to do this, that you are trying to highlight the fact, for example, that within certain groups of people that we may indeed have systems or standards or procedures that do the equivalent of what you are trying to do to the judges. I acknowledge that. There are things in existence and systems in existence to do that. To expand those injustices to the area of judges is not the solution. The solution is to correct the others.

SENATOR CLARK PRESIDING