

think that the people, the citizens in the State of Nebraska want to vote on our salaries. They want us to meet it head on. They don't want us to come in the backdoor, they don't want us to camouflage anything. They want to vote on the exact dollar amount. I think that we need to go directly to the people. The problem with some of the members of this legislature, they don't have the guts to put it right out to the people. I think that the Legislature should also set the salary of the constitutional officers in the state and also the judges. I urge you to vote against the committee amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Stoney.

SENATOR STONEY: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I rise in opposition to the adoption of the committee amendments and also as a member of the Constitutional Revision and Recreation Committee I oppose this bills advancement to the floor of the Legislature for collective debate. I would just like to say that testimony was given before the committee by a gentleman who is an instructor at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Mr. Robert Sittig, who provided some valuable historic information relative to such proposals being placed on the ballot here in the State of Nebraska. Mr. Sittig's information indicated that over the past ten years the subject of an increase in salary for the state Legislature has been before the people on eight occasions. With the exception of 1968, when the present salary was adopted at \$400 a month, all have met with defeat. I would like to lift from the statement that was given by Mr. Sittig some specific information on each one of these proposals. In the actual voting on these eight compensation questions voters approved just one in 1968, when they increased legislative salaries to their current level. In the seven attempts since then a variety of proposals straight increases in 1974 and 76 and I don't know about your counties but my county in 1976 the vote in opposition was greater than it was in 1974. A statutory system in 1972, expense reimbursement in 1972 and 1978 also. A commission approach in 1970, retirement plan in 1972 and they have all gone down to defeat. Usually by a very narrow margin or a very close vote, the only exception being the commission approach. The commission approach, ladies and gentlemen which we are considering presently, that was soundly defeated. Now you don't have to be a actuary or a mathematical genius to realize that the last eight times we placed this on the ballot we have expended tax payers dollars generally in the \$25,000 category. Now that approaches nearly a quarter of a million dollars over the past ten years to place this issue before the people. I think that they have spoken, ladies and gentlemen,