

March 24, 1981

LB 475

dismissed and yet those people sat there and lost their jobs, not only their income but lost their jobs. So I guess what I am trying to do, John, is just make the point that our society does say judges are different and given special treatment because judges usually are not said, you go to jail until your trial comes up because of the position you hold in society we are going to let you go on your own recognizance and this is where I am coming from. We are putting judges and attorneys above the law and one other reason that has compelled me to support the amendment more than I originally had intended to is because so many attorneys are against it on this floor. So I am going to support the amendment. It is probably going to fail but I am going to support the bill.

SENATOR DeCAMP: I don't think attorneys are necessarily against the amendment. I think you are seeing some of the attorneys say they are for the Constitution which some days in here is awful difficult.

SENATOR HIGGINS: I agree they are for the Constitution. I think all forty-nine senators are. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Before we go to another speaker, in the North balcony from Senator Wiitala, Senator Stoney and Senator Koch's district, 12 adults from Omaha, Nebraska, representing the South West Omaha Republican Women, President Mrs. Frieda Reed. Where are you located? Would you hold up your hands, please. Okay. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, first of all there were two words that have to be struck from the amendment as offered. "Loss of" will have to be taken out so that it says "without salary". That is the intention of the amendment so that it is clear for everybody what we are talking about. Now, if the proposition that was mentioned by Senator DeCamp that one of these constitutional officers cannot have his or her salary reduced while in office for any purpose, we passed an unconstitutional bill last session which placed requirements on sheriffs to take continuing training and for every month they do not take the training, they forfeit that month's salary. So maybe that bill is unconstitutional and everything else in it then would be unconstitutional which was LB 428. So there are a lot of things about the Constitution which I think senators, judges and lawyers will not come face to face with until an issue is sharpened and defined in terms of that constitutional provision so that it can be examined. When Senator Cullan read from LB 82 last year that said, "after the completion of the canvass" then, and the Governor's certification, this proposition would become part of the Constitution, I do not question that. But I still say