

historical occurrence on this kind of legislation and that usually those who introduce it is someone who is planning to retire from the body, at least it's not unusual, because it tends to be highly controversial. I introduced it because I just simply believe it's correct that those salaries are different that what they currently are. I could not in good conscience argue that those salaries last changed January of '79 should remain unchanged till January of 1991 and that's what we're arguing. I would agree that a higher salary does not mean you're going to have better people in an elected office, but I also know that it's going to make it, enable a lot of other people perhaps to consider who otherwise would not be able to consider even filing. There is one other thing I want to say about the Governor's salary. It's a pet peeve. One of the things I do not like that governors are forced to do, and we all know it, they have...I don't know what they call it, governor's fund, some kind of a contribution in which a whole host of costs that are incurred by the person seated in that office are paid from. For example, in the seventies I remember they used to run a list of who paid for their football tickets and who didn't and I remember the list would show what the Governor paid for his football tickets. Then you went and checked up political accountability and they were paid out of that fund. Now most of us, I pay for mine and many of you do. No big deal, but I pay for it personally and I don't think, I don't like that a Governor's salary, and if you don't think there aren't additional costs just as we know there is additional costs to us that serve here, there is additional costs there too. And I'd just as soon that that salary be at a level that doesn't, in effect, force the individual serving as the Governor to go out and seek contributions for expenses that ought to be personal. So I would hope you would recognize the appropriateness of the bill as it has been amended and advance it. I understand these are bad times, but believe me, I do not believe they are going to remain bad times through 1991. I don't want to believe that. As a state we can't afford to believe that and that's what we're talking about, the basis is because it's bad today, bad times, and you're convinced that it will remain bad, then perhaps it is a good argument. But they are not going to remain bad unless we talk ourselves into it. So I would urge that you advance the bill. It is a reasonable compensation and one which ought to be done this year because it has to be done this year or not at all.