JOINT PUBLIC HEARING

BEFORE

SENATE AND ASSEMBLY JUDICIARY
COMMITTEES

February 12, 1971

S.J.R. 23, S.B. 82, S.B. 121, and S.J.R. 1
(55th Session)

Chairman Monroe called the joint meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Committee Members Present: Chairman Monroe
Senator Close
Senator Foley
Senator Dodge
Senator Swobe
Senator Wilson
Senator Young

Assembly Judiciary Committee

Others Present: Judge John Mendoza
Judge Richard Waters
Assemblywoman Juanita White
Judge John Barrett
Judge Frank Gregory
John Collins - former Supreme Court Justice
Ernie Newton - Secretary, Nevada Taxpayers Assoc.
Mr. Russell Waite - L.V. Court Administrator
George Dickerson - Board of Governors
Harry Claybourne - President - Clark County Bar Association
Judge Tom Craven
Bruce Beckley - Las Vegas Attorney
Harold Wandersford - Chamber of Commerce
Jean Taylor - Chamber of Commerce
Mr. Alvan Whortan
Mr. Michael Hines
Mr. Ned Adamson

JUDGE CRAVEN: I think all of us agree on the basis for this bill, that is a strong and competent judiciary, and the method of eliminating anyone holding office who does not have those qualifications. I think there is another method to accomplish our goals. A composite of the Missouri Plan using the method of selection based upon qualifications, the appointment under part of the Federal Plan during good behavior, and tenure under the California Plan, where a judge is held answerable to a commission. The language used in the federal plan is: "A person shall hold his office during good behavior."

That means the only way a federal judge can be held to account is by impeachment. It has worked well because it has attracted good men by giving them an excellent wage and an excellent retirement plan. But it has two great weaknesses, it is too involved in politics and secondly he is put in a position where he is responsible to nobody. The California Plan would provide for scrutiny by a watchdog committee, and I think it would be a very desirable thing.

I am definitely for all members of the supreme court having tenure, and all district court judges having tenure. If under a plan that is going to require judges to go to the election political process, it is an undesirable matter.

I'm very ambivolent about this bill. I don't know if I'm whole-heartedly for it or not. There is the aspect of it that if this passes that the district court and the rest of the system will never come about. There is also the aspect that it may be the most healthy thing in the world and ultimately bring about the goals which we wish to accomplish.

SENATOR DODGE: When we considered this, the real problem we faced was not the most desirable system, but what we could get voter support for. The consensus of the subcommittee study was that we were going to have a problem getting anything accepted by voters that consisted of change, so we'd better be realistic enough not to strive for the ultimate idea, but to sell a system that would go part of the way. In fact, this was a compromise. Ultimately, we hope we could sell the appointive system at the supreme court level, and develop a certain amount of confidence in that, and then try to do it in the district level.

CHAIRMAN MONROE: Would you like to speak on S.B. 121 regarding Court Administrators.

JUDGE CRAVEN: I think that its inevitable that we have to have a court administrator system.

CHAIRMAN MONROE: What about S.B. 82, which would increase the number of judges in the first, second and eighth districts, do you have an opinion on that?

JUDGE CRAVEN: We definitely need them in all districts.

JUDGE MENDOZA: I will first speak to what I believe to be the problem with the bill presently under consideration, which is S.J.R. 23. Most of us are aware of the study Senator Dodge has made reference to, Nevada Court Structure.

We are not in opposition to tenure for supreme court judges. We are concerned about administrative control which may possibly in its application apply to the independence of decision and the role of the judge in deciding cases. We feel there might be a dissolution in that regard. I am not speaking against the present administrator's bill because I think we're going to have it eventually and its a step in the right direction. If this bill were to go through, the district judge would be the only political animal or politician who would have to run for office, and then could not seek any other. He runs for district judge and then continues to run in an open field thereafter in his own particular spot.

One of the other problems that we have is if we have the administrative control

from the supreme court, we also have to go to the ballot box in an open election. And then we also have the constant problem of, and maybe rightly so, the removal commission, but as we have noticed, we have had one or two members of the high court involved in political races, both on a lower level and on a level involving the court. There is nothing in this bill that protects us and those of us in the lower courts from that happening in the future. This of course the court could take care of very readily by passing a rule which absolutely prohibits any of their members from doing that and I think would satisfy that particular fear.

The other of course is the problem that the Missouri Plan for selection and tenure and the California Plan for discipline and removal should be adopted together or not at all. Then if you will look at the district court judges under your constitutional amendment, we will be the only politicians or candidates for any office who can, while we are in office, be removed by a commission. What I'm pointing out is that rather than reinforcing the judiciary, you have really weakened the fiber of the only court, the court of original jurisdiction, the court that is beset by most of the pressures of the community, and yet we are left open by this particular bill to these particular onslaughts.

We submit to you what I consider a modification of this problem. If we are really concerned about can we sell it to the public, then lets look at it as a merchandising object. Let us take a look at district court judges, and say, yes, we can sell the concept of requiring every district court judge who is selected by this commission to run in an open race the first time. What does that accomplish at the next general election? It accomplishes a vote in that particular district by his particular constituency, and states, yes, we want this individual to be our judge in an open field. Thereafter, he would then go under this plan, the tenure plan, and then be subject to the various controls within the plan. We submit this to you. We have prepared through the Bar Association a proposal in that regard and we would be very happy to present it to you for your consideration.

In summation, I might say this. We are not opposed to S.J.R. 23 as such. We are opposed to the effect of S.J.R. 23 without the additional safeguards to district court judges.

SENATOR WILSON: One thing you said that bothers me -- your comment close to the outset in which you said that a judicial administrator would compromise the independence of the decision making process of the district judge.

JUDGE MENDOZA: My conversation with other judges who have been under the administrative situation, have been that the administrator had that power to move you from district to district. He in effect, if you are unpopular so to speak, he can move you. The other problem, is that a judge runs in his district and if the administrator really wants to take care of him, he can send him to another district, and the people of his own district have no say so. He is removed by an administrative officer who does not elect him, who he is not responsible to, but can place him someplace else.

I'm for the concept of an administrator because we instituted it to try to move the calendar along. But when you have the appointive power, the power to move that particular judge anywhere in the state, you have problems, as long as you keep us in the elective process.

JUDGE WATERS: I would like to subscribe to the remarks that Judge Mendoza read from the report of the subcommittee that was presented in the last session. I was on the subcommittee that has been mentioned this morning, and regarding S.J.R. 23, I remember very distinctly that the Missouri Plan was proposed, the California Discipline Plan was proposed and the subcommittee as stated in their report was very voiciferous that the disciplinary matter should be accepted along with the tenure that the committee proposed and that the two had to go together. And then when it came out of the last session, the discipline was in for the district judges, but there was no tenure for the district judges. I think it points to the district judges and says your elected but need special discipline, no other elected official is faced with that.

I would also point out that in the resolution which you've proposed, if a judicial officer wants to run for non-judicial office he would be able to do it under this proposal by resigning. That's a distinct change from the amendment passed by the people around 1960.

On S.B. 82, I don't feel the first district needs a third judge.

However, I think Clark County needs at least 10. I base that on a study I made two years ago, on the basis of population alone, Clark County should have at that time had 5 more judges than they got in order to reach per judge population that Washoe had at that time.

On S.B. 121, this bill concerns me very much. The powers that are given to the supreme court are given to them because they're given to an administrator and the chief justice. They're contrary to the provision of the constitution I believe. I think a very potent argument for the belief is the fact that those administrative powers are also written into the joint resolution (S.J.R. 23). If the legislature presently has the power to pass 121 why is it in the joint resolution amending the constitution.

If Clark County and Washoe County need an administrator I think they should have one. I don't think an administrator appointed by the supreme court who sends judges around, who is given the powers set forth in S.B. 121, could possibly have the knowledge of the needs of the various districts in this state that the local judges have.

I have an objection to Section 7 where it states that a court administrator may direct any district judge to hold court in an judicial district where the need therefor exists.

SENATOR DODGE: One of the functions of the court administrator we're definitely interest in is the fact that somewhere in our system we've got to be able to make judgement of when and to what extent we need additional judges. The legislature has no objective information upon which to make a judgement about creating additional judgeships. Would you agree that at least on this function, that this position would be desirable.

JUDGE WATERS: As a statitisical clerk certainly. But I frankly think that should be a function of the Legislative Counsel Bureau. The legislators are the ones that need the information, so I don't think it should be a court function.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WHITE: I have been requested to speak to you the basis of the position of the justice of the peace in reference to the small districts as proposed in S.J.R. 23. I represent the small communities in Clark County, District 1. The only incorporated area in that district is Boulder City. We are served by a justice of the peace. We are the people who elect the judges and who will pass this bill if it does get passed. The people in my district do not want their justice of the peace removed from their control. They want to elect their justices and they want to vote for a man that they consider will administer justice, they don't care whether he's a lawyer or not. And they are very apprehensive about a system in which they might have to travel as far as a round trip of 200 or more miles in order to reach a court, which would not be under their own, so to speak, jurisdiction.

ROY TORVINEN: This bill provides for county court judges who are locally elected in the county, not maybe in small townships as justices of the peace are, but they're still locally elected, who will be better trained and better qualified than most of the justices of the peace we have today.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: I might add to Torvinen's remark the county court is a court of records, and would be an assist in case you wanted to appeal. You would still have the same rights as you would in small claims court.

SENATOR DODGE: Am I not correct, that there is every flexibility in this system about where you locate courts. We're not about to leave somebody 200 miles from where they can have an arraignment or some other prefunctory type matters heard or certain trial matters.

Also, if S.J.R. 23 goes to voters, we will have enacted in this session, a county court structure so that everybody will know exactly how that court will be implemented when they go to vote on S.J.R. 23.

ERNIE NEWTON: My capacity this morning is as one of the elected steering committee members of the citzens committee. We attended conferences held by the subcommittee on the county court structure. Those conferences were held in Las Vegas and in Reno and involved in excess of 200 people at each location. We studied this legislation and I feel that S.J.R. 23 is the consensus of that group of 400 people.

The consensus of the group, and they elected 16 people to speak for them, was that an ultimate desirability would be a combination of the Missouri Plan and the California Plan for disciplinary procedures. However, there was substantial objection to taking district judges and municipal judges or justices of the peace, out of the elective process. Consequently, by I think an overwhelming vote, it was decided to go with provisions of S.J.R. 23.

I feel that the time will come when we will cover district judges under the same or similar procedure as is covered now for supreme court judges under the resolution. It may even be that county courts will come under the same procedure. The problem of county courts got involved with the "marrying sam" justice of the peace and justices of the peace were generally adament in their objection to anything that would challenge their livelihood. Consequently, they were left out.

I think that some of the arguments that have been raised today are not realistic, in the first place a judge may run for elective office if he is prepared to

resign in order to run. And I think the citizens group that met felt that a judge who ran for elective office, should resign when he became a candidate. In fact there was considerable comment about judges using the prestige of their office to support their political candidacy in some other field. A judge may run for judicial office without resigning.

The matter of assignment realistically doesn't bother me. Because ultimately the chief justice is the one who makes the assignments. I have no apprehension whatsoever about the integrity of chief justices. During these citizens conferences, then Chief Justice Batt was very vocal and sincere in his urging that the chief justice of the supreme court, if he was going to perform his primary function of deciding cases, needed somebody to do the paperwork, or the statistical work if you will, but more important the administrative job of running the court system. And the chief justice now has the authority to assign judges and doesn't consign them so that they can't wage an effective campaign if they so desire.

Regarding the matter of municipal court judges or county court judges, I don't think there's any thought that they wouldn't essentially perform the same functions that justices of the peace now perform, except perform it so much better. First of all it would be a court of record. Then I'm sure the district judges would agree that most of the sticky cases they get are the result of an error made by some incompetent justice of the peace and have to be done over again in the district court.

JUDGE BARRETT: I'd like to speak first to S.B. 121 which has to do with the court administrator. My objection to S.B. 121 is primarily what Judge Waters said, that is there is an appointive officer who does have control, and I realize its under the supervision of the chief justice of the supreme court, but still its over an elected official.

However, my main objection at this time to S.B. 121 as it is now worded and intended, is that it is unconstitutional. Under the constitution as it presently exists, I don't think the legislature has any power whatever, and I say this with all due respect, to provide the supreme court with an administrator who has control over the district courts. The constitution as it now exists, very specifically sets out the powers of the supreme court and nowhere in those powers is there mentioned any power over district courts, to control what they do or how they do it, except of course for special writs, such as mandamus. It was mentioned by Mr. Newton that presently the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court has the power under a law which was passed some years ago to assign district judges and so forth. And its true there is such a statute, and in my opinion that one is unconstitutional too. The only reason that it works and the courts have functioned under it is that the district judges have cooperated. I simply want to point this out and not by any means give the idea that I or any one of my fellow district judges are recalcitrants of some kind who are going to absolutely refuse to do something that would further the administration of justice. But I don't think the legislature should be passing laws that are unconstitutional even if somebody is willing to go along with them.

If and when S.J.R. 23 again passes the legislature, goes before the voters, and the constitution is amended, then there is a different proposition.

Regarding S.J.R. 23, I'm not opposed to it. I'm disappointed the district judges were left out. I don't think an elected official should be subject to

disciplinary actions by a commission. But, I think its a step in the right direction and I wouldn't oppose it, but simply hope that the change will come at some later time.

With regard to S.B. 82, the bill proposes the addition of two district judges in Washoe County and I would say that we do need two additional district judges. What we're using there now is substantially six and are not able to make the grade as it is.

JUDGE GREGORY: I think everything that can be said about S.J.R. 23 has been said. I'm disappointed the district judges were left out but I'm not going to oppose the matter on that ground, I think it's a forward step. One of the principal points I should like to bring to the committee, is in opposition to S.B. 121 so far as the authority of the court administrator or the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in the matter of assignment of district judges is concerned. That the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court is a person apart and above petty jealousies, I can't accept that. It is possible that the provisions of Section 7 of this bill could be used to completely wipe out a trial court judge.

The principal point that I am here before the committee this morning for is in connection with S.B. 82 and the provision for an additional judge in the first judicial district court. The difficulty in the first district arises from a geographical arrangement of the five counties in the district. We are required by law to hold court regularly in each county seat of each county. And that involves constant travelling. As it is arranged, every alternate week is classed as a "law week." A law day is specified by the Supreme Court rules as a day when the court hears all criminal arraignments, probate matters, estate matters, motions, judgements, all of the preliminary matters that go to make up litigation. That leaves a total of 26 weeks for trial work in each department of this first judicial court, plus whatever time we can scrounge for vacations. We have a different situation from the courts in such counties as Clark and Lincoln where the judge is permanently located in the county, because we do have to do this travelling. We have approximately 60,000 population in these 5 counties and we have two judges and we don't have the time to try our cases. I have between now and the 4th of July, 26 trial matters set on my calendar scattered around the district. Of those, about 80% are criminal cases. It means simply that a civil litigant is not getting his cases to trial, no matter how hard we try because we must give precedence to criminal matters. We utilize judges from other districts. I don't have figures with me to back it up, but I would estimate that 1/3 of the time is spent by those judges.

ASSEMBLYMAN ROY TORVINEN: Judge, would it alleviate the situation in the first district if one or more of the counties were removed from the first district, and placed in other districts.

JUDGE GREGORY: From the standpoint of the burden on the courts it would. There are two possibilities, the district can be divided or we can add the other judge. Personally I favor adding another judge rather than changing the district.

JUSTICE COLLINS: Having just completed over 5 years on the Supreme Court and having spent the last two as Chief Justice, I have some very distinct impressions. First I think that S.J.R. 23 should be enacted. I'm not completely thrilled with exactly the way it came out. I would have liked to have seen the

district judges covered by the tenure system also. I'm not anxious to deprive the people of their power to elect the public officials, but I just don't think the office of judge lends itself to an effective or desirable political type of campaign. It was not the Supreme Court who had anything to do with having them not included with the tenure provision.

Secondly, I would remind you that it takes a long time to amend the constitution of this state. If we don't do something pretty rapidly we will lose the benefit of the time that has been invested in this attempt to amend the constitution up till now, and I think it would be a mistake. So I frankly feel that S.J.R. 23 should be passed again by the legislature and offered to the people. On the question of the court administrator, S.B. 121, I have no question in my mind that the judicial system of this state needs a court administrator. There are no broad statewide statistics available to us to tell us how the judicial system in this state operates. The judicial system is basically divided into two functions: The judicatory function and the administrative function. Judges should have the time available to perform their judicatory or judging function and have some help by people who don't necessarily need to be trained to the high degree in the law that judges need to be trained in order to handle the administrative functions of running a court system. Nevada really hasn't reorganized its judicial basically to any large extent since it was organized as a state. It seems to me that its necessary to undertake this reorganization at an early time. If we don't we are going to have even more congestion in our courts than we do now. The people who really suffer when your judicial system breaks down are those people who have cases to be litigated in those courts. Those are the people who I think we should be basically concerned about in how we reorganize our judicial system. As far as more judges are concerned; yes, I do believe there are some more judges needed in this state. I'm sure there are more needed in Clark County since I've been there and I know from my own experience that the case load in Washoe County is increasing all the time.

The ability to call back district judges and former Chief Justices is highly important. It increases the judicial power to call back people already trained, and it is vitally necessary.

SENATOR DODGE: Do you subscribe to the constitutional point that Judge Barrett pointed out?

JUDGE COLLINS: I wrote a case just before I left the court in which we delt to some extent with those legal and constitutional questions in assignment of district judges and we spelled it out pretty well in that opinion what the respective powers are. I doubt constitutionally that you could probably have an appointive administrative officer interfering with the constitutional prerogatives and powers of the district judge.

Now as far as the Chief Justices power go, I agree that there's some question there as to the full extent of his constitutional power to make those orders. But on the other hand, the experience I've had, was that there was a spirit of cooperation and we attempted to adjust our judicial business so we could aid the heavier populated counties with heavier case loads. And I think that same spirit of cooperation will prevail. I can't believe that any Chief Justice is going to get so overbearing in the performance of his duties that he would arbitrarily start assigning district judges.

ASSEMBLYMAN MAY: The testimony developed so far has neglected one area I'm somewhat concerned with, and that is the complete abolition and no replacement anywhere in the resolution for the municipal judges, the people's court as it were.

ASSEMBLYMAN TORVINEN: The constitutional amendment says all justices of the peace become magistrates and then its up to the legislature to set the jurisdiction authority of the magistrates. The constitutional amendment also provides for county courts. So we have two things then; magistrates and county court judges with their jurisdiction set by the legislature. The magistrates would have very limited jurisdiction; they would take pleas and hear small claims cases. Most trials will be handled by the county court judges.

We did put a grandfather clause in our proposed legislation which would allow a municipal court judge or a justice of the peace to qualify for appointment as a county court judge if he can meet the qualifications of the selection committee, and we did exclude the qualification of being a lawyer for those first justices of the peace and municipal judges who were elected at the election of 1972 or who were holding office as elected in 1972. So on the first go round of appointments, non-lawyers could be county court judges, after that they couldn't be. After that the county court judges will be elected, and they'll have to be lawyers, but the magistrates won't have to be.

JUDGE MENDOZA: I am representing a group from Las Vegas.

We are addressing ourselves to S.B. 44 and S.B. 82. I have for the record with us from Las Vegas, our court administrator and retired Superior Court Judge from the State of California, Russell Waite, Mr. George Dickerson of the Board of Governors of the Bar Association, Mr. Harry Claybourne, President of the Clark County Bar Association, Mr. Bruce Beckley, Attorney and also former President of the Chamber of Commerce, We also have representatives of the Chamber of Commerce - Mr. Harold Wandersford and Jean Taylor. Also with us today are former judge Alvan Whortan, and Michael Hines and Mr. Ned Adamson.

Basically, we have compiled information to try to bring you up to date as to what our present situation is. In 1967 we started the year 1500 cases behind. With the employment of visiting judges we were able to have up to nine judges sitting in Clark County. We used county commissioners offices, and the Sheriffs Auditorium and even the Federal Court building. We were after a full year able to catch up with the calendar. However, we were not able to keep and maintain that number of judges in the district. We came to the legislature two years ago and asked for two additional judges and our request was denied. As a result, we then became forced with a mounting problem in the juvenile area. I went to then Supreme Court Justice Collins and asked for Rule 27 to implement the referree system in Clark County. The referree now handles all of the contested matters and all of the arraignments. One referree heard 12,023 matters last year. He also had 1,300 detention hearings. And on top of that I heard 2,100 dispositions, that is sentencing of juveniles in our area.

We have over 20,000 more population per judge in our county than any other county in the state. We have had a case filing increase of 270% with an increase of judicial manpower of 50%. The number of cases per judge is approximately 2500; which means 10 cases per judicial day for each judge. The State of

California uses a figure of between 1,100 and 1,200 as total number of figures for filings per judge. We are double that in our district. In the past 5 years we have had a 100% increase in criminal cases filed and that last 10 years a 700% increase in criminal cases filed. In juvenile cases we have had a 90% increase in the past five years and a 400% increase in the last 10 years. Once again, keeping in mind an increase in judicial manpower of approximately 50%. Our calendar clerk stated we have 1500 cases now pending. There are 1,014 civil cases awaiting trial setting with an additional 406 cases set for trial. There are 176 criminal matters set for trial and 226 waiting to be set. We have a massive problem, we are very far behind. We believe that with these statistics we have show a definite need for judges.

JUDGE WAITE: California tries to keep filing rate at approximately 1,100 to 1,200 per judge. The way California keeps track of this figure is through court administrator, who is called the administrative officer of the courts. There are about 20 to 25 counties who have a court administrator. It is their duty to furnish these statistics to the state court administrator who in turn delivers them to the judicial council, composed of 21 members who are judges, attorneys and laymen. They determine the assignments and the need for additional judges throughout the state.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Judge Waite, based on statistical information we have in comparision with the California system, how many additional judges would we need in order to meet that criteria.

JUDGE WAITE: We would have to have a minimum of 4 to keep abreast of the filings, and we couldn't even begin to dip into the backlog. We'd have to have 6 to catch up to the backlog.

SENATOR CLOSE: In California does the court administrator have the power to assign judges to different counties.

JUDGE WAITE: No, he does not have that power. All that he can do is make a survey of the judicial needs and recommend to the judicial counsel where assignments are needed. Now the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of California is the Chairman of the Judicial Council and he makes the assignments.

GEORGE DICKERSON: In behalf of those firms that are either on the plaintiffs or the defendents side, they are in a desperate situation at the present time in Clark County. As far as the number of civil actions awaiting trial at the present time, we have 1,014; 406 have been set, but the balance are still remaining to be set. There is just no way in the world they can be accomodated with the number of judges that we have in Clark County. You have to look at it from the standpoint of not only what the cost might be, and I know we address that to another committee, but you have to concern yourself with the cash flow of the community. Because if you get fast administration of these matters, and you aid the small businessman, the contractor, and those who are not receiving the money that they should be receiving, and which are tied up in litigation of this nature, then you do increase the economy of the whole community.

I was probably the most conservative member of our board of governors when

the problem was presented to our board with reference to the number of judges Clark County needed. At that time I said "don't go in with a budget that asks for more than you actually need." I am firmly convinced, and I state honestly to you, Clark County definitely needs 4 judges. There is no way in the world that we don't need one exclusively for the handling and processing of the juvenile matters. Because if there is one area of the law where a judge is confronted with the most sole-searching of his decisions, it's in the juvenile area. He has to give his time to each of these matters, and he must give to it the thought it requires because the determination he makes can well determine the destiny of that youngster that's before him.

HARRY CLAYBOURNE: I'm here as President of the Clark County Bar Association as well as Michael Hines, Vice President of the Clark County Bar Association. The Bar Association passed a resolution at our last meeting, recommending at least four more judges. Now its the considered opinion of the Clark County Bar as a whole that we need more than 4 judges. Because by the time we get four, we're going to need six, and eight the year after that, to even keep up with what is there now pending, and to hold a status-quo; not even taking into consideration the growth of the community, and the increase in litigation. The thing that we're concerned about is that with the load that our judges are carrying in Clark County now, which is better than 50% of the litigation in this state, that its just almost impossible for a judge to give the proper amount of attention to important cases that he should give.

Every time we have to declar a moratorium in our district, every time the backlog starts getting up around 1,000 cases, the citizenship can not understand. Lawyers can understand it, but we are knowing the quality is being diminished as far as the ability of the judge in his decisions and opinions. There is nothing in my opinion as bad as reckless decisions, or judicial opinions and decisions written without thought and meditation. I don't mean that our judges aren't doing a good job in that regard, I am surprised at the job that they are doing.

ASSEMBLYMAN TORVINEN: I was convinced that Clark County needed at least four judges before this meeting started, I would only say to those people who are here that these matters have to go to the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee. I'm already convinced, and I hope that you can convince the people in those committees.

Meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Wynkoop

Eileen Wynkoop, Secretary

Approved: _____