

March 24, 1981

LB 475

the laws and uphold the laws that they are, in fact...

SPEAKER MARVEL: You have forty-five seconds.

SENATOR VICKERS: ...a little bit different, therefore, to say that while you are under indictment we are going to continue to pay you is, I think is wrong and if the people of the State of Nebraska had realized that last year, I don't think they would have approved that constitutional amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Stoney.

SENATOR STONEY: Mr. Speaker, I would call the question.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Do I see five hands? All those in favor of ceasing debate vote aye, opposed vote no. Have you all voted? Record the vote.

CLERK: 28 ayes, 0 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Debate ceases. The Chair recognizes Senator Chambers to close.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, so that you will understand clearly what the amendment does, in line 10, the two words "loss of" would be stricken. So it would read, "without salary while there is pending." Then after the word "retirement" on line 16 would be the language that indicates that should the judge be found not guilty or not retired or removed from office, any salary withheld would be paid over. Now in the interest of total candor I would have to explain a bit further how the language on pages 8 and 9 can be offered without conflicting with anything in this bill or with anything in the Constitution right now against reducing an officeholder's salary during his or her term of office. Anything in the Constitution can be modified by a later action of a constitutional nature. So there could be a blanket statement in the Constitution against reducing salary while in office. Then a later amendment could be offered which said, "with the exception of" and then list the circumstances under which such reduction could occur but it would be a matter of constitutional provision dealing with constitutional provision or modifying it. The two provisions that are in the bill itself relate to the first instance where the State Supreme Court under the conditions laid out in the bill would find that a judge has comported himself or herself in such fashion that a six months suspension should occur and a part of that suspension would be the denial of salary for the six months. Since that language is in the Constitution it would not be