

March 29, 1982

LB 603

in the dark again. In response to 816 I did not vote in support of that bill nor did many of you. Again we are going to get some surprises on that perhaps, but that is not anything new. I have been involved sometimes myself when I have caused you to have some surprises, and I have been held accountable for the most part. So I think that in this case we should not vote for this amendment. We do not know what the cost will be. What we are doing now is we are piggybacking the judiciary on the state employees at a time when it is expedient to do so and then in the event that the economy turns around again, we will want to unhook them and give them a different kind of a raise and the state employees then will limp along with a lesser raise. It's the same old story, you ride coach when you don't have any better vehicle but you go first class when the first class seat is available. You make up your mind what you think is the most equitable. As I said before, you can't guarantee we are going to raise those state employees, and you say, well, what harm is it then if we go this route? The harm is this, as I said before, you tie them to the state employees at a time when you can't get anything else and you unhook it for hopefully next year if the economy improves. Let me tell you this, if the economy goes down the dump, you will be unhooking faster than ever next year. You will all be over here trying to say why you shouldn't tie the judiciary to anyone else. There is one more discrepancy there and I am a little bit amazed, Senator Kilgarin, that you would fall for it because of this. If you maintain state employee wages at a certain level and you only have so many dollars to handle it, you know what happens to state employees. You lay them off. No job. Now, I come back again to the question, a job and no increase, or an increase and no job. Except we are not going to lay off the members of the judiciary. It is going to be the lower paid state employees that bite the dust. I am opposed to the amendment.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Newell. People turn their lights on and then they take off. Senator Beutler. Senator Labeledz. Senator Marsh.

SENATOR MARSH: Senator Labeledz is here.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Labeledz, go ahead.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Senator VonMinden made a remark a short time ago about a secretary not needing as nice clothes as a judge. I just wanted to bring up the fact that the judge wears a robe and it is no concern to anybody what he wears under his robe. A secretary does need nice clothes