

this wording does no harm. I don't think that it is always true and so I would like to leave it just like it is.

PRESIDENT: Now, Senator Whitney.

SENATOR WHITNEY: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I'm going to oppose the amendment, I asked the director of personnel of all of the people that you know of how many have not been considered satisfactorily? He is thinking in terms of perhaps hundreds of employees when he answered this question. I would feel that even in the thousands. He said so far as I know that only three persons who have not considered satisfactory. So this amendment doesn't really mean to much but it does give the heads of departments some discretionary power and I think that it should be left in their hands to have this discretionary power to use those terms if the work is satisfactory. I think that we are taking away from the administrators something that they should have, power that they should have in order to do the proper job of administering state government.

PRESIDENT: Next to speak on the motion was Senator Carpenter, Barnett, then Simpson. Senator Carpenter has the floor.

SENATOR CARPENTER: Pass

PRESIDENT: You are passing? Alright, Senator Barnett.

SENATOR BARNETT: Mr. President, members of the Legislature in answer to Senator Whitney and probably what is going to happen is that the budget is the budget committee is going to stand up here and probably try and defend the budget. I hope not, I hope that is the way it looks so far, two out of three with the exception of Senator Marsh. If what Whitney is saying is true, why don't we add on their an amendment on there Senator Whitney that says with the approval of the agency head is what you are saying which is entirely ridiculous. You are giving out false hopes to the state employees that if their performing their duty satisfactorily, and that is a word that you can defend properly and maybe Senator Whitney would have a different objection to it or a different idea to it and yet an agency head could say, well he is doing his work, it is not quite satisfactorily so we don't have to give him a raise. The state employees under this bill, and under the appropriations merit feel that they are going to get a raise if they are entitled to it. In the way that you two gentlemen have spoken ahead of us, the agency head could keep a state employee on in the employment and still yet say that he is still not doing it quite satisfactorily. Which this is what you call for. I don't think that is fair to the state employees. I think that word in itself causes the contradiction in this piece of legislation right here, in this part. If that word satisfactorily was out of there and you told the state employee that he was going to get a raise if he is doing his job, then he is going to get a raise, otherwise he wouldn't be working there. But you give the agency head too much leeway here. He says that he is doing it, but not quite satisfactorily. Then we have the same problem that we had a year or two ago with state employees when they thought that they were going to get a raise and they didn't. I certainly am going to support the amendment either Senator Lewis' or Senator Marsh, having been in that position under a grading system.

PRESIDENT: Senator Marvel, Whitney, Proud, Senator Marvel.