

CLERK: Madam President, Senator Warner would move to amend the bill. (The Warner amendment, AM1986, appears on pages 2371-72 of the Legislative Journal.)

PRESIDENT MOUL: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President and members of the Legislature, this reflects an amendment which was voted by a split vote on the Exec Board to adjust the salary appropriation for the legislative staff. The amount of the appropriation would amount to 137,000 for the '91-92 and additional 254,000 for '92-93. As the amendment...excuse me, as the appropriation bill was drafted for the legislative appropriation. You will recall probably from some of the briefings that the legislative appropriation assumed certain levels of reappropriations from the current budgets which then, as was true of other agencies, would be used as a part of the full appropriation that the Legislature would then receive. Secondly, that the increase in the salaries for state employees, as well as legislative employees, would be 3 percent March 1, plus 1.5 percent on their anniversary date which could be considered...well, that's the way it would work. In addition, I believe that there was an additional 1 percent that could be allocated on merit if the employee was below the midrange of their particular salary classification. That's not a factor, as I understand it, that affects the Legislature. The amendment that is proposed and would fund instead of the 1.5 percent on the anniversary date of the date of employment with the...by the employee, it would permit up to a 5 percent at the discretion of the division head or the legislator if you are talking about the...the staff that are individual legislative staff, so you would have that discretion just as you have now. For the past several years the Legislature or the Exec Board, rather, has approved that level of salary adjustments and for the reason, of course, that there was sufficient funds in the budget that would permit it and sufficient funds in the service limitation that would permit it. The vote of the Exec Board was 5 to 3 to offer this particular amendment. I would say that the arguments of those who did not support it was generally one that state employees and the legislative employees ought to be treated comparable and that there should not be a significant difference. Those who supported the increase would have done so for probably two or three reasons and those who were in support will probably identify that argument, one of which is the fact that legislative employees do not have the same kind of security