

at least I am not aware that it did during the hearing process or the discussion of the patrol's budget but I would rise to oppose it for separate reason. I have indicated on other amendments that the committee is reviewing the benefits, the employee benefits relative to either housing or to meals for all of state government. We will be doing a substantial study between...the interim between now and next session. It would seem to me that it would be inappropriate to make this adjustment here when we have a number of other agencies that have policies that I think ought to be reviewed in some uniformity, at least in terms of logic between those that are reimbursed and those that are not should be developed. We have programs in the Department of Welfare and the Department of Education, Corrections, the Department of Institutions, the University, State Colleges. We are reviewing all of these and I think that it would be inappropriate to adopt Senator Schmit's amendment at this time but rather any consideration ought to be a part of the total review of such programs throughout state government which we will be doing over the summer and I urge the body to reject the amendment.

SENATOR NICHOL PRESIDING

SENATOR NICHOL: Senator Fowler, did you wish to speak on this amendment?

SENATOR FOWLER: Yes, I wish to speak against Senator Schmit's amendment. As was indicated this did not come to the Appropriations Committee. I know that it is very difficult to vote against the State Patrol, but I guess I would like to remind the membership here of several other salary supplements or special salary adjustments that we have made that we have not offered to other state employees. It seems to be almost an annual activity to come in with some sort of special adjustment and in so doing supplement the patrol's salary. In the past several years they have done that so that they get increases beyond what other state employees do. I do not think necessarily that this should be an annual custom. A few years ago in the Appropriations Committee a special allowance was made for longevity. Adjustments to try and raise increases of those patrolmen who had served longer than others. This was done. This has not been done for any other state employees. In addition to the longevity increase a cleaning allowance was brought in for the patrol, a monthly amount to supplement their salary to be used for that cause. That was increased a year ago. Now this year we have another sort of complement to the regular salary increase. Each year it is a new rationale. Each year it seems perfectly legitimate. Each year it is very