

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Withem.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Yes, members of the body, I will take that challenge, Senator Chambers, and I think at least as far as the way this amendment is drafted, at least the way I read it, I think you are taking the wrong course to get to where you want to be as a result of this. But, first, let me just indicate to the membership of the body I introduced LB 189. At that time, it contained one additional juvenile justice for Sarpy County. That measure has passed in LB 19. It is up there on the desk, perhaps on the way to the Governor's Office as we speak. Senator Crosby prioritized LB 189 because when it came out of committee it contained the Sarpy County juvenile judge, a Lancaster County district judge, and a Sarpy County district judge. Senator Crosby prioritized it because of her interest in the Lancaster judge. That bill, that just passed. That was in LB 19, along with the Douglas County juvenile judges, so the two people that are most responsible I guess for having this bill on Final Reading, Senator Crosby and me, no longer have our personal interest in the bill. So it's not...I'm not going to be standing and doing a lot of vigorous defense of LB 189. I think it's probably good policy. We went...we caved in, those of us interested in judicial reallocation caved in maybe more than we should have, so I'm not as excited about LB 189 as maybe some other members of the body should be. So I'm probably not going to be doing a lot of strenuous defense of the bill. I would point out to Senator Chambers, and follow along with this argument, if you would, Senator Chambers, and please take a look at it. First of all, LB 189 will repeal existing Section 24-201.01, so there will no longer be 24-201.01 as we now know it. Your amendment strikes lines, I believe it its, 4 or 3 through 19, 1 through 19, but leaves lines 20 through 25. The way I read it, what you would be doing if your amendment is successful, we would no longer have any reference whatsoever to the salary of the Supreme Court judges in statute, and I do not think that's the right policy. You can argue whether it's too high or too low or all of those other arguments, but I do not think it is the correct idea to take it out of the statute. That was the fight we had on LB 394 earlier, and it was my position, and I believe it was yours at that time, that we ought not to leave it just up to the Appropriations Committee. If this amendment is successful, then I believe we would have a provision beginning with in the statutes, the chief justice and the judges of the Supreme Court shall hold no other public office, et cetera; lines 20 through 25 would continue to be