

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

June 3, 2005

LB 683

you do things on a percentage basis it can sound overwhelmingly out of order. But if you look at the fact that our salary increase in 1988 went from \$400 a month to \$1,000 a month, what huge percentage increase that appears to be. But when you look at the actual dollar amount, it was still next to nothing. So I'm hoping that we will vote to override, bring these salaries to a respectable level. Then we won't have to consider in the future making very large increases. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Further discussion on the motion to override? Senator Redfield.

SENATOR REDFIELD: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. I supported the bill as it came out of the committee with the committee amendment; however, I did not support the final bill because I did agree with the Governor that in fact I felt that the percentage increase was excessive in a short time frame. Do I think we should get there? Yes, I do. I do believe that we should have three equal branches of government. When I look at what the judiciary is paid, I do believe that the Governor's Office is worth more. But I am also looking at the average annual pay in 2003 for Nebraskans, and I see that we are ranked number 40 in the nation for our citizens. And when we ask the taxpayers to foot the bill, I think we have to be cognizant that when we look at averages that sometimes being at the midpoint may actually exceed the wherewithal of the people. I would remind everyone here that we actually have another chance next year to address this issue before the new term of office would take place, so we do have an opportunity to address this in a more modest proposal. I would also tell you the Governor could have taken another tack if he felt that in fact the other constitutional officers were underpaid in proportion to our population, and he could have actually signed the bill and then he could have taken the increase that was given to him and he could have generously donated it back to the state. So there was another option for the Governor here if he felt that, indeed, all of the constitutional officers who would be affected by his veto would be shortchanged in his decision. So I would again remind you that we have an opportunity to address this next year and we may want to go back to the committee's recommendation, which was \$100,000 for the Governor on down.