

SENATOR WARNER: Right, a little less.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay, thank you very much.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, I rise to concur in the committee amendment. I may as well, in that process, make a couple other comments because the committee amendment does become the bill. First I want to make it plain that inasmuch as I have objected to other bills that had a fiscal impact being advanced from General File, I will make the same objection on LB 43, and will not ask to have it advanced today. But I would like to discuss it and handle all the motions that anybody wants to make on it on the assumption that it ought to be in whatever shape it is going to be as of today so that the final fiscal note, after those amendments, can be properly attached, and we'll know the cost. Saying that I also want to say that over the years I've been through a number of discussions on salaries of constitutional officers. As a matter of fact I went back and read the last discussion out of curiosity assuming that most of the comments that I've heard periodically over the last 20 odd years would be made again. Constitutional officers salaries seem to be a sensitive political issue. Traditionally, as I think back, most of the time the senator that introduces it is someone that has no political ambitions, or is not running again, or a whole series of things, none of which apply to me. It so happens that I just think that an appropriate salary for constitutional officers commensurate with responsibilities is a reasonable and proper thing to do. You can look at other states. One criteria that is sometimes used in that case we are very close to the bottom looking at most of the offices. If the bill is passed we would be in the upper level. However, it would not again be changed until 1991. It is reasonable to assume that other states will have made adjustments in that time period as well. Another guideline you could use is the last salary adjustment was in 1979, other than for the Public Service Commission. You can take the average increase that state employees generally have had up to this time and make an assumption of an adjustment through 1991 and you will come up about at the same level, in some cases a little less, in some cases a little more. In any event, my reason for introducing the bill is pure and simple, as I