

them to tighten their belt, those people who have already taken a dollar to two dollar an hour cut in salary per hour, we are going to tell them that this year after only a month ago we met and cut our budget \$40 million, now we are going to begin to increase it and the fiscal note doesn't even tell us how much it is going to cost by the time we get to 1990. It just gives this year. This year is enough, sixty-seven some thousand dollars. I want everybody here to know that I am not opposing this as a candidate for Governor. I am opposing it the same reason I did when I was a state senator in 1981 and '82. I do not believe that you will attract better people because you pay a higher salary anymore than I believe that our superintendents of schools have done a great job because we pay them \$71,000 a year, \$87,000, \$84,000 almost \$75,000. I think some of the reports we've seen on education show us that high salaries do not necessarily follow that you get the best and the brightest. I will withdraw this motion to kill this bill, Mr. President, because in the five years I've been here I've only once made a motion to kill any other senator's bill and so following that same precedent, I will withdraw this motion. I made it primarily so that I would have the time to respond to the remarks of Senator Landis and to what I consider pretty much of hitting below the belt remarks Senator Withem made in talking about how easy it is when you're a candidate to stand up and oppose something like this. It is not easy to stand up and oppose a bill which I think has already been greased and will probably pass. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: It is withdrawn. We're back to the bill. You have no other motion, do you? Senator Chambers, you are next on the bill.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I have always supported salary increases for public officials and I still do so, even though on occasion there have been people occupying an office whose style and the substance of their administration I didn't particularly care for. But in a materialistic society such as this one, and it cannot be denied, that this is a highly materialistic society, the value of a thing, not the cost, the value is often determined by the price tag attached to it. Whether that is right or not is the subject for another debate. But in view of how people consider the value of even a person, it is, I think, a mistake not to offer what would be