

ought to be adjusted and changed, if that is what needs to be done, and should be done to move forward, whether it be in this issue or any other issue. So, again, I suggest that this is the wrong approach with just going forward with the appropriation. Senator Withem has the right approach by making it contingent on a statutory change. I support the Withem amendment. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Wesely. Senator Wehrbein, on the Withem amendment.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Yes, Madam Speaker and members, Senator Withem, could I ask you a question. What bill do you propose the judges get paid on at this point?

SPEAKER WITHEM: In the LB 18...well, I propose the judges get paid on this bill, on 394. If you mean where will we have the policy choice of deciding whether we have the pay increase or not have the pay increase, it would be on...that discussion will take place on LB 189 yet this afternoon.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Okay, so that will be up?

SPEAKER WITHEM: That will be up and it will be considered this afternoon.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: All right. The reason, I am not going to live or die on this amendment. I guess it is up to you. I figure this is up to the body. I had a bill that went to Judiciary Committee that I carried for, I guess, the judicial branch, simply to put in appropriations. I don't...I am not going to live or die on it. It just seemed like the judicial branch was entitled to being considered. Now I understand the difference in position on this, and I respect that. I am not going to fight it on that issue. The reason it is in 394 because I think the Appropriations Committee felt, and I certainly did, that the judges had a right to be paid and participate in the increases, and so we put it in. I consider it a form of a safety net here. I didn't know where 721, by the way, that authorized this change, did come out of Judiciary Committee, but that's as far as it's gone. It is still on General File. It was not a priority, so it hasn't moved along, and so the reason we put it in this bill is that there would be payment to the judiciary side. And if the body feels strongly that they want to consider this each and every time and, potentially, I assume want to treat judges differently from time