

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

February 28, 2000 LR 291

hate to think that it ruled other than as it was logically and ethically and morally compelled based upon its understanding of the law.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Spoken like a true legal Fred Astaire. Thank you, Senator Brashear. The only thing I want to make clear is that there is not a law that the Legislature put on the books that stated explicitly that this matter of when a judge's salary increase can take effect. There was no statute enacted by the Legislature which said explicitly that the situation, which we face today, had to exist. I want it to be clear that the judges did play a part in it. So, on occasion, they have to come to the Legislature and say, help me, Legislature. What I wish my colleagues would do is to help me, not me, help the cause of justice by being as concerned about the ethical misconduct of judges as we are about their salary. We are concerned enough about them getting a salary increase that we, brothers and sisters, will amend the constitution. We will amend the constitution to do so. And I'm going to support the effort. But the law says he, the law should say any person because there are females, but at that time women were victims of the law, not practitioners of the law. He who seeks equity cannot come with unclean hand. When you seek equity, you cannot be a wrongdoer yourself. Equity is that part of the law that deals with those morals, those ethical types of issues which cannot be handled strictly at law. Law is where you deal with damages. You plead your case on the facts. It has to be done within certain constraints of pleading and so forth. Equity is a looser area, looser in the sense as not...of not being so hidebound and other matters can come in for consideration. Now there are other judges about whom I could speak but I'm not going to because my main purpose this morning is to show that there are some serious problems in the judiciary. There are some misbehaving judges still there, and the Supreme Court still is not doing what I think it ought to do, even though I've given them credit for doing certain things. Remember, judges are lawyers too. Judges are lawyers before they become judges. But a peculiar thing happens when a lawyer becomes a judge, their point of view shifts because the Nebraska Supreme Court had ruled in a case that before a lawyer ever had a private client, the lawyer owed a responsibility to the courts. The courts were where the lawyer's primary responsibility lay. But I'm wondering if