

enacted as written... I wish Senator Schmit were here, but let me read anyway the figures based on what we have here. The current salary of the Supreme Court judges is about \$66,000. On July 1, based again on the figures here, and even if the dates would have to be pushed back somewhat to accommodate the lateness of the bill, the difference in the amounts would remain the same. July 1 they go up to \$70,000 which is about a \$4,000 increase. Six months later they get a \$14,000 increase. Senator Weihing, are you hep to that? Six months later they get a \$14,000 increase to \$84,000; then July 1, 1991, another six months passes and they get nearly a \$6,000 increase to \$89,900; then one year later, July 1, 1992, they get an additional \$6,000 increase, up to \$96,200. This is a substantial amount that is being put into this bill at one time. There should not be that gigantic 20 percent increase in their salary. I told Senator Schmit that I intend to fight this bill and I do. Senator Wesely mentioned some of the concerns that I have about the way the judiciary deals with the Legislature. I had given some of my negative reactions to the court and the way they operate when we talked about LR 8 which is designed to take certain constitutional rights of appeal to the Supreme Court away from the citizens. So this Supreme Court has come before the Judiciary Committee and has talked to other senators to oppose bills that would give the Legislature and the public some input into how that branch of government operates, the type of input which is justified, namely, something to say about how these judges are selected. They can come in and oppose those bills. When it comes to getting less work for themselves, they have a lineup of people who are at their beck and call, they pull the string and they jump; Little Sir Echo, Little Miss Echo, if there happen to be any of those. So you can count on a certain lineup of people in here to support any bill that the judges want, to oppose any bill or proposition that the judges oppose. To me, they don't walk on water. They cannot, by speaking, change water into wine. Although when you read some of their opinions and the way they twist facts and write judicial fiction, you would get the impression that they think that by stating something which is contrary to all logic that something becomes a reality. It becomes a reality in terms of deciding cases because the law, itself, is a realm shot through and through with fiction. Judges, law professors and any student halfway through the first year of law school understands what is meant by the term "judicial fiction". They fabricate the existence of something which does not really exist and then will treat it as though it does exist for the purpose of fashioning