

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And after that the built-in increments are still there. Sometimes it is wise to accept what you are offered, but sometimes it's good not to because you may have the strength to reject that and, nevertheless, get exactly what it is that you're after. But what these judges are being offered in this bill, LB 42, as written is unconscionable. So I'm in support of my amendment and I hope I can get enough to add it.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Hefner, did you wish to speak about the Chambers amendment?

SENATOR HEFNER: Mr. President and members of the body, this amendment I believe is a little too low. I said I'd support Senator Haberman's amendment and I was prepared to add an amendment a little while ago that would say we'd give them a 10 percent increase the first year and then a 5 percent for the next two years, but Senator Haberman's came closer to my thoughts than did Senator Chambers'. And, Senator Chambers, I'm looking at this from a little different angle. I think our judiciary is doing a good job. I don't have anything against our judges because I think they're doing a good job and I know you have a difference of opinion there. But I wish somebody would answer this question for me. If we're paying our judges such a low salary, why do we have so many attorneys coming forward when there is a vacancy? Would anybody care to answer that for me? Okay, you can probably answer it in your closing then, or when you get a chance to talk. But, Senator Lindsay, you said prestige won't pay the rent. Well, anybody that is getting sixty some thousand or fifty some thousand, I think that would pay a lot of rent. That would pay a lot of groceries so I don't think we're down that far. But I certainly will support a little. I think that when we have a vacancy, we have a lot of qualified attorneys come forward and submit their application and so...and like I said before, they have a good retirement program and I feel that's worth a lot. A lot of private attorneys don't have that when they practice in their private practice and so I think we need to think about that. And so at this time I'm going to oppose Senator Chambers' amendment, but support Senator Haberman's because I feel that is more in line. At the present time we have a good economy and maybe it wouldn't hurt us to pay a little more but what's going to happen down the road? I don't think our economy can stay this strong and then we're going to be short of funds again and we're going to have to cut here a little and cut there a little. So I would say that we should probably be realistic about this and go just a