

are above, what is it, 30, 35 years of age, have been in practice for five years, but we are not after that type of person. What we are after is the most qualified people, the people whose very lives you would trust within that. Senator Baack's amendment is attractive for one reason. A couple of years ago we recognized that the university faculty needed to have their salaries brought up. They were lagging behind in the rest of our peer institutions in the Big Eight, and so what we did is we gave them two salary increases, 10 percent one year, 10 percent the next year to catch them up, to raise them up. This is similar. You have got 13 and seven, so there is some precedent for what Senator Baack is doing here, that that was another area for where we recognized we had fallen behind. We have lacked in our obligations and in our duties to bring those people for comparable pay with people who are doing a similar job, and we are wanting to raise up that attractive scale of pay. And so what Senator Baack's amendment, what it really would do for us is not to have the huge increase the first year. It would cut it down by more than a third, and we would wind up with salaries somewhere in the range of seventy-nine, five for the district court or for the Supreme Court, seventy-three, five for the district, and sixty-seven, five for the county court. So I would urge you to defeat what has got to be the most surprising amendment in the Legislature this year, a Hefner-Chambers amendment. I never thought I would live to see the day, and if I see a Chambers-Orr amendment come in, I don't know if I can finish the session. But I would urge you to defeat this amendment, but remember that it actually occurred. Thank you.

PRESIDENT NICHOL PRESIDING

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Haberman, please, followed by Senator Langford.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Well, Mr. President, and members of the body, what we are trying to be told, they are trying to tell us that for 3.3 percent, we are not going to get qualified judges, because that is what the amendment does. It only lowers it 3.3 percent. Now think about that. They are saying the 3.3 percent reduction will not get us qualified judges. I don't really buy that. I would like to throw something else out into, put it in the record, as Senator Chambers says, if a judge goes...the Supreme Court goes full term, when they retire, when they retire, they can draw \$58,000 in retirement a year, plus