

March 24, 1980

LB 998

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Would you be in favor of looking with the rest of the time we have for this session, that all of the state agencies in making a similar provision for any state employee who may be similarly situated?

SENATOR HEFNER: I would say at the present time I am just interested in highway patrolmen.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I know you are. That is what your amendment covers but I am trying to find out if this is a philosophical position you are taking based on an employee having extra expenses or whether it is limited to the State Patrol because it relates to law enforcement.

SENATOR HEFNER: I would have to think and study that over.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Does the fact that we are talking about the State Patrol, and it is a law enforcement agency, have any influence on your judgment?

SENATOR HEFNER: I think it does, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Did the State Patrol, to your knowledge, Senator Hefner, get an increase in salary this year?

SENATOR HEFNER: Yes, state patrolmen are receiving an increase in salary but not all of them are receiving the 11% as was stated earlier on the floor.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well now, one other question. This proposition that you are bringing, would it be in the nature of a brand new program for state troopers or is it just adding on to an expense account that they already have?

SENATOR HEFNER: This would be adding on to an expense account they already have because I understand when they stay out overnight or are on long trips, then they can put in an expense voucher.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That is not what I mean. I mean per diem. Does each state trooper get a per diem right now?

SENATOR HEFNER: What was that question? I was reading a note here instead of listening to you.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That is alright and the note is probably less pointed than the questions. Does the per diem that you are talking about now attach itself to an existing per