

March 22, 1982

LB 488A

particular year is what this A bill would cover. Now they are saying that they can absorb it for that period of time and we did not need the A bill, so even if we pass the bill LB 488, which I fully intend to have read on Final Reading, and if this body passes it in its present form, so be it, and they will absorb it and we will go from there.

SENATOR KAHLE: I would like to alert this body that this is a sleeper because while we are trying to blunt the cost of this salary increase for this fiscal year if we don't do something about it, we are going to allow the salary increase to take place for the other...what would it be, seven quarters or seven halves of the four-year term and I don't believe that is the intention of this body. So I am not so upset about not passing LB 488A but I don't believe we are facing up to the problem. I think we are trying to sweep it under the rug. So I alert you that if this bill is killed and the 488 passes, you are going to put into motion a terrific or considerable increase which we thought was legitimate last year but under present economic conditions I think it is out of reason. So for that...I am surprised that Senator Goodrich hasn't come in with an amended A bill for 488 that would be more reasonable. Now the only choice we are going to have is either to vote 488 when it comes up, up or down, which will mean either a considerable increase for those offices or none at all. I don't know what to say at this time only to make you alert to what could happen because if there is no A bill you are either going to have to vote it up or down.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I haven't talked to Senator Goodrich. I didn't realize the kill motion was there, but I would oppose killing it at this time. I think it ought to be advanced and there is two or three things. Number one, I would be very hard pressed to treat this differently than we would any other change in appropriation. If we can reduce the various agencies involved by the dollar amount of the increase in the general appropriation bill, then pass the A bill, that would be a straight-up way to do it I would think and consistent with the way we handle other legislation. But I also can...it seems to me and this is really off the top of my head, but it seems to me that there have been occasions where there are court cases that if the Legislature has approved a salary adjustment for constitutional officers and I think probably in the case of judges and did not make the appropriation they have still ruled and DAS has paid whatever was required by that statute as the Constitution taking precedence and in