

Senator Chronister's explanation and I think that I detected the hand of an acquaintance of mine in the explanation. It was clear, if you followed it all. But it was not simple. Now he had me until he brought up LB 475. Because he should remember that some of us are very troubled about provisions of 475 which will continue to give salaries to these scoundrels, the ones that have been indicted, for Senator DeCamp's information, were actually indicted. To be frank I don't see a connection directly between these two bills. We know that there is not much likelihood that any stringent action will be taken against a misbehaving judge. The history of handling of judges in this country, in this state, and in other countries throughout the world show that judges are practically immune from disciplinary action of any significance. Now, Senator Chronister's explanation reminds me of an example that I think that I have mentioned on the floor, and every lawyer has heard it, probably every lay person, where a defense attorney asked one question to many of a person on the witness stand. He was questioning this individual and his own client was accused of having bitten the person's ear off. So he asked the witness, "Did you see him bite the ear off?" The guy said, "No". The lawyer said "Well how then can you say he bit his ear off?" The witness said, "I saw him spit it out." What Senator Chronister did was went one step further than was really necessary because it provoked discussion of other matters related to the judiciary. I don't think that every level of judge is equal to every other one. I don't think that there is ever necessarily a correlation between the different levels. I don't think that there is a correlation in terms of the amount of work that has to be done, the amount of effort expended, the excellence of the individual judge. If you read opinions, if you read memoranda written by various judges, you will see that there is an unevenness of quality. So before a bill is offered, which might give increases of up to 20% to certain levels of judges, consideration ought to be given as to whether that increase is in fact justified. If there were a unified court system, then perhaps you could see tinkering with some of the issues that are brought up now. But there is no way to ensure quality judges. There is no way to ensure competency. Every time a bill is brought to increase or modify the salary of judges and even when we talk about modification as in this bill, it is always modification upwards, so I think that we can call it a salary increase bill, for at least some of the judges. Discussion is always given of the increased work loads.