

for a long afternoon. I am not sure that I will offer any amendments after this one, however, but this is what you could do. If you have questions this bill could be returned to Select File and allowed to stay there and that would be time to get answers to questions that you may have. If the answers do not satisfy you regarding the validity of my attempt to amend the bill, then you can advance it after you get your answers back to Final Reading without any amendment being added. There won't have to be any modification of this Final Reading copy and there will not be that much delay of the bill. It only takes 25 votes. You would probably have them anyway if I can't persuade you but on the other hand there are some issues which often have to be raised by a less than majority. That is because the majority will not consider an issue which seems technical or difficult and especially if it seems to involve a relatively small portion of the populous. But this bill involves not just the judges. It involves the criminal justice system and its administration. It involves all of the citizens who may have any contact, directly or indirectly, with the judiciary. The judges have, as a matter of fact, been placed upon a pedestal. I am wondering how many citizens would support such a proposition as this if they knew that a judge could have been caught and handcuffed right after fifty people saw him walk into a place where his wife worked and blew her brains out. He still is entitled to go to trial. He will be charged but he gets a salary. The state continues to support and subsidize him. Maybe it will be found that he is innocent by reason of insanity and if he is, maybe he could stay on the bench and continue to draw a salary because the judicial qualifications system may decide not to remove him for that basis. Every judge has a bit of insanity about himself anyway. That makes his rationality just a bit more to the point. Now if you really believe that until a person is convicted by evidence there should be no punishment, you should take away from the State Supreme Court the power to disqualify a judge from functioning as a judge. Let's say that the matter does drag on through the courts for five years or three years or just six months. Here is a judge who has publicly been stripped by the State Supreme Court of all judicial functions because he or she was charged with a felony or a crime of moral turpitude and then a court finds the judge not guilty. You know what everybody is going to say, don't you? Judges, watch out for judges. We had a prosecutor who was willing to risk his or her career by bringing the charge. Then the judges all flocked together and protected the scoundrel and now he or she is going to be sitting up on the bench judging me and calling me wrong for having done something and sentencing me to the penitentiary when what I did was less serious than what he did but I don't have any friends among the judiciary. There is nobody to come and stand up for me and say, it will