

May 12, 1983

LB 617

twenty some percent. If we raise it by \$1 million, you are up in the neighborhood of 27 to 30 percent some- place, and I don't think that that is at all unreasonable in any sense. I also wanted to point out to you that the particular court fees that we are suggesting, \$40, for example, \$41 in the District Court, I wanted to compare that for you to some of our surrounding states. In Kansas it is \$55. In Iowa it is \$35. In Missouri it is \$45. In South Dakota it is \$28. In Colorado it is \$75. Minnesota is \$55. Wisconsin is \$40. What we are asking for in Nebraska is about in the middle of those figures. It is not excessive in any sense. So I don't think there is anything inappropriate not only philosophically but there is not anything inappropriate in terms of the dollar amount that we are talking about. I think that you do have to ask yourself the philosophic question, what is wrong with asking criminals, for example, who burden the system with paying a part of the cost of that burden? I don't think there is anything wrong in a philosophic sense with doing that. Another point, Senator Chambers' main argument seems to be that somehow this is going to tend to corrupt the judges if we add \$3 or \$5 to the court fees. First of all, I think you have to look at that proposition in a little more detail. Now a great many of the cases that go before our courts, of course, are civil cases and not criminal cases, and in a civil case either the defendant or the plaintiff is always going to pay the court costs. So there is no question of the judges being corrupted in that area. With regard to criminal cases, maybe...I don't know what percentage of them but a great many of them are indigent anyway.

SPEAKER NICHOL: One minute.

SENATOR BEUTLER: So there is no question there. So the question only pertains to a narrow band of criminal cases and then what you are being asked to believe is that a judge is going to somehow be corrupted to say that somebody is guilty because he wants to collect an extra \$5 in that case. I just think that that is beyond common sense and beyond a common sense analysis of the character of our judiciary to even suggest that that is a likely proposition. I hope you will vote against the Chambers amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, about a couple weeks ago when we first proposed the concept of increasing court costs