

CLERK: I have the one offered by Senator Newell and two offered by Senator Reutzel. One of Senator Reutzel's I understand he wishes to withdraw. Is that correct Senator? Page 1557 he wishes to withdraw.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Okay, Senator Reutzel asks unanimous consent to withdraw an amendment to 586 found on page 1557. Is there any objection? If not so ordered.

CLERK: Mr. President, the second Reutzel amendment is on page 1623 of the Journal.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Yes, 1623.

SENATOR REUTZEL: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, in keeping with the Speaker's wishes I'll be brief. All this amendment does is to go back and redo the refigure the raises that state employees are going to get. As it is now about two-thirds of the state employees get 7% and the other third get about 4% plus there is a 3% discretionary allowance that the department heads can dole out to those in supervisory positions. My amendment would give everyone 7% straight across the board. Now the reason for doing this is very simple. It just takes the office politics out of the dispersement of the funds. I think that we are all aware of what can happen in a situation like this. I'm not saying that it necessarily would. It is my understanding in talking with Mrs. Peiper that most, if not all of the agency heads that she has talked to have indicated a desire to just go ahead and give everyone the 7% anyway. But this amendment, if adopted, would eliminate the office politics, would eliminate the procedure whereby the department head could reward some or punish others and we get rid of the office politics situation. It simply gives 7% to the remainder of the state employees. I move the adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Any other discussion on the Reutzel motion? Senator Warner, do you wish to speak on the Reutzel...okay.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I would rise to oppose the motion. Over the years you will recall that we have had discussion from time to time for some discretionary authority on the part of the head of an agency in granting raises. In the past we have proposed across the board covering all employees and that usually has been objected to. Particularly in the lower wage scales where so called office politics or whatever may be a factor or the brother-in-law or somebody was mad at somebody. But also this year recognizing that in the lower pay scales that the full 7% would be appropriate the