

March 29, 1982

LB 603

SENATOR CULLAN: It does, but not if the committee amendments have been adopted and the bill was enacted.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Yes, but the committee amendments were not really drawing that much favor I don't believe. I think at this time, Mr. President and members of the body, I am adamantly opposed to the advancement of the bill. I would hope that those of you who have concern about the salaries of the Supreme Court judges, and I am sure we are all in agreement on that, would agree with me the bill stays where it's at until something better can be worked out if it is possible. As has been pointed out, it may not be possible at this late date, but there are many other bills which are not going to be discussed, that have never had the opportunity to be discussed and so at this time I would ask you not to advance the bill. If you move to advance the bill now, ladies and gentlemen, you are being totally inconsistent with your prior votes. Now if you think that is easy to go back home and explain, try it. I have done it a few times and I will tell you what, they will chase you around the barn a couple of times on that one.

SENATOR CLARK: Amendment on the desk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Hoagland would move to amend the bill. (Read the Hoagland amendment as found on page 1450 of the Legislative Journal.)

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Hoagland.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Mr. President and colleagues, this amendment is basically the Cullan amendment at $3\frac{3}{4}$ percent instead of 5 percent. It does not change the percentages set out in LB 111 as the committee amendments would have done. It goes back to what Senator Cullan attempted to do earlier today by increasing the salaries of the judges 5 percent each of the next two years. This amendment does it at $3\frac{3}{4}$ percent which is as you know the percent that we are currently considering increasing state employees' salaries for this coming fiscal year. Now I think there are a lot of you who may have been reluctant to have voted for the 5 percent increase that would be more amenable to voting for a $3\frac{3}{4}$ percent increase. I don't want to go over a lot of the arguments that have already been made today except let me point out again that this is the last opportunity we have until the 1984 session to make any change in judicial salaries. If we don't increase judicial salaries at all this session, they cannot under our Constitution be increased again until