

May 7, 1981

LB 541

amendment, Senator Nichol and the other Senators' amendment. They are...the state patrol are forced to eat in public places. It is a mandatory requirement, and I think it is only fair that we reimburse them for this expense. Thank you.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Marsh.

SENATOR MARSH: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I rise to oppose the proposed amendment, and my reasons for doing so are based on the fact that my personal highest priority for state employees, all state employees, includes a decent increase in salary for state employees. This amendment was brought to the Appropriations Committee. It was one of the items considered. It was my personal belief that the members of the state patrol as well as other state employees would rather have a higher salary, higher than came on the request from the Governor. My personal commitment was to raise that salary as high as we could raise it within the Appropriations' dollars. Some of you might think it would be difficult to speak against it with our fine help looking on this morning, but conscience tells me I should rise to speak to the overall budget, the look at all of state employees who need the increase, not one category set off against another category. We have added additional dollars. We have added another category last year of uniformed officers so that they would be eligible for an increase, and with that in mind I do not believe this is the year for the additional dollars in this one category. I am highly desirous of increasing the salary level for all state employees. Do we endanger all other increases if this one is adopted?

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Stoney.

SENATOR STONEY: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I, too, rise in opposition to this amendment, and it is not because I am not supportive of the state patrol because that is not true. I think that Senator Warner has touched on the monetary and economic impact that this will have, as has Senator Marsh. But I think there are other considerations that should be given also. The most important one is that an exception is being made for a distinct group within state government, and I don't think that that is a good policy. Already the patrol is receiving a telephone allowance of approximately \$8 per month, and a cleaning allowance of \$20 per month. Now are there other state employees that serve the citizens of Nebraska that should be given the same benefits? And additionally are there others that should receive the benefit that is being requested at