

any action or not, but they would not have had any increase. We was concerned, and especially I was concerned that there would be none if we didn't take action. I am not clear on what, Senator, if we go with LB 189, Senator Withem, if we use your bill...if we'd use your bill for salary increases, you think it would be constitutional, even if there was judgeships and salary in the same bill?

SPEAKER WITHEM: Oh, sure, because the appropriation is in this bill. The appropriation...

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: If we had not done...if we had not done anything with 394 as has been told that we should have done in our naivete.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Yeah, I think so because there would have been a 189A, which would have included the judges salary increase.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: And you would have had that appropriation carried in that A bill only, is that what you are saying?

SPEAKER WITHEM: Yeah, or it's here in this bill. I mean it is here in a separate...

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: No, no, but I...knowing what Senator Chambers has told me at this point, I wouldn't have it in here. So there would be no salary bill.

SPEAKER WITHEM: I guess I'm confused by the question.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: We have mistakenly, as the Appropriations Committee put the judges salary in this bill, apparently.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Well, I am not sure. It is a policy difference. I view...

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: I thought it was more than that on Senator Chambers' part, I understood it that way. So if we had not this bill, how would the judges have gotten paid?

SPEAKER WITHEM: The judges...

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: That is my question.

SPEAKER WITHEM: The judges would be paid by this bill. Where