

are going to do the job that we want them to do, should have that wide gap closed and that would be an indication on the part of the Legislature that these people are really judges, that no longer are they going to be the caboose on the end of the train catching all of the dust but getting none of the benefits of being a part of the train. That is what I would have to say. When this bill was in committee, originally I wanted to support it in the form that it was drafted with some modifications as to dates and other technical matters but the figures basically I was in favor of. When that had difficulty with the committee and primarily because of what was contemplated on the floor as awaiting the bill, I moved to kill the bill. I think I moved to kill it. I said I wouldn't support it, attempts to change it. Well now we wind up with the bill where it was in committee as originally introduced and I think if there are bullets to be bitten, this is one of them that the Legislature is going to have to bite and now I will tell you what the decision is that I think we ought to make on this bill. Either we are going to set up a plan whereby the judges are handled on increases like other state employees which they really are or they are going to have to come here once every two years begging which they most assuredly will do. It doesn't seem quite right that judges doing the kind of work they are doing for the society should have to beg once every two years. Although as I said before them when they were at the committee testifying on the bill, there is a certain power that it gives to a Senator or anybody else to not have to stand up when one of these fellows walks into the room, to have him addressing you in an obsequious respectful manner, using the same ability to act that we mortals use to act when we come before the judge and play like we stand up because we respect him. We know these are forms. Do you want them to come once every two years or do you want to set up a plan whereby they don't have to do it? Regardless of what is done I think Senator Reutzel's amendment should be adopted and the reason I think it should be by striking that escalator clause we can then talk about the bill itself without that element hanging over the entire discussion and I believe, Senator Reutzel, your amendment will carry and I want to express my approval and favoring of that amendment and I don't know whether I will speak on the bill any more because I think I have done as much as I can do for the judges without sullyng my reputation as being anti law enforcement.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Lewis, then Senator Stoney and then Senator Nichol.