

of judge and the job they are doing. I don't need another group of judges making that decision for me. I think it is legitimately mine. I think this erodes my power. I think it is a poor idea, and I urge you to vote against the bill.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That is probably the best thing I have said all day and the record didn't get it so I have to repeat...yes, Senator DeCamp and members of the Legislature, I am going to speak and I oppose this bill. We were having a little discussion, Senator Chronister, and if you think the question has enough significance you can answer it when you close, but when you mentioned the dignity of the Legislature, did you misread, or did Walt misspell? I was just curious and I don't really know the answer. But I am opposed to this bill for the reasons that I gave on General File. I will not offer a kill motion or do anything to delay taking a vote on it. However, at every opportunity there is to discuss the bill and I am in the Chamber, I must express my opposition to it. When I mention the word "accountability" and it is attached to the concept of the Legislature, I don't mean that the judges have to give opinions that are pleasing to the Legislature, I am talking about things like workload, how many hours a day the judges will work, whether they show up in court on time, if there are orders entered that deal with say visitation right, are those rights enforced and if one of the parents complains that he or she is not being given these rights, what will the Judge do? This is what I am talking about, the discharge of their duties that are imposed on them because they are judges. I think that this is a poor bill and we ought not tie all of the salaries of the judges to that of the Chief Justice. It is not wise and I don't think it is justified. There is no static correlation between the various courts and the Chief Justice of the State Supreme Court. There is no logical relationship. All we can do is create an artificial one legislatively, and to me it is as ridiculous as saying there is a drought in Nebraska so the Legislature will vote that it will rain tomorrow, so that means it is supposed to rain. It is as ridiculous for us to say that there is a static relationship between all of the courts and the Chief Justice. If he is interested in maintaining tighter control over the courts, and because he exercises what I consider to be a wholesome influence, I am not opposed to it in his case. There has to be a better and different way of exercising that control than the instrumentality of