

of discretion. They are easy targets and they are easy targets here in the discussions on LB 603. They are easy targets for political posturing, for an attempt to keep costs down, to signal some sort of false economy to the public. There is no mention of the counterparts in the public sector, not the private sector but the public sector of attorneys that we hire and that local political subdivisions hire. They receive wages far in excess of these judges that are so important as guardians of our Constitution, guardians of our criminal process, guardians of our tort system and guardians of the commercial contracts that keep business and industry flowing in Nebraska. We pay out of other pockets of ours sixty thousand dollars and more for public sector attorneys and yet posture that we are doing some sort of great service to the state by keeping the lid on a 2½ percent increase for judges. In my own humble opinion I think we will rue this parsimony. I think that this shortsighted and essentially malicious attack on the judiciary will haunt us if not because judges will suck it in and will go two more years without pay increases but because ultimately we have to think to ourselves what it is that we have done to carry out our Constitutional responsibility to defend the Constitution, to defend the laws of the State of Nebraska.

SENATOR CLARK: You have one minute left.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Senator Clark. And to further the cause of justice which is our obligation as well. I am not sure that the Senator Cullan amendments have much of a future. They certainly have my support, and I hope they have the support of those who even in hard times feel that the pursuit of justice and the pursuit of a quality bench to determine issues of public policy is one of the highest priorities that we can exhibit. I intend to vote in favor of the Cullan amendments. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Nichol.

SENATOR NICHOL: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I would like to be an authority on judges' salaries having kicked around in it for the past eight years and I think the only one that perhaps might be an authority is Senator Stoney because he did do an indepth study on it. But Senator Dworak asked the question a little bit ago about the fiscal impact and if you will notice the fiscal impact that has been passed out to you for 1982-83 the additional amount would be \$115,000 plus, in 1983-84 it would be \$237,000 plus. Apparently where the problem with us is, in two areas, the district judges. We have 47 of