

renovating our facilities and I said at the time that I thought we should be willing to hold back and cut back and be economically frugal also, and that if we are going to enter into a situation where we are going to not give our employees increases, then it seems to me that we should at the same time not be building ourselves nice pretty convenient offices or hearing rooms here in the Legislature. Now that amendment lost. We, as a body, chose to keep that \$500,000 in there and I am going to watch the board and see how those people who voted against taking out that \$500,000 for us are willing to vote when it comes to the state employees' salaries. And I can assure you that my position is clear, that if we are going to hold down the cost of government across the board meaning ourselves as it affects our travel and many other things, then I am willing to tell the state employees that they also should have to wait awhile, but until we make that determination for us to hurt a little, I am not willing to tell the state employees they are going to have to pick up all of the burden. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I also will be brief in my remarks but I have to get something clear first. Senator Fowler, maybe you can help me with this question. Not with the question, I can handle that. You can help me with the answer. Senator Fowler, are members of the Nebraska State Patrol state employees? Would they be affected by this amendment? Thank you. Members of the Legislature, I have heard on this floor many times glowing defenses given of the State Patrol. They have been lauded in the highest terms about their professionalism and what a job they do, often thankless and unheralded by the public. So it would seem to me that it is not good and it is not proper to praise these employees when it serves a certain purpose if we are dealing with a bill of some kind, then when it comes time to show our praise is genuine, tell them they will not get the raise on schedule as they have been led to believe they would. That is not good and that is not right. What I am saying about the Patrol would apply to all other state employees but I mention the Patrol because they are highly visible and they are often singled out or more regularly than any other category that I am aware of for praise by members of the Legislature. So I am going to have to oppose Senator Howard Peterson's amendment. Often I am accused of being antilaw enforcement but it shocks me that a conservative of such impeccable credentials as Senator Peterson's could offer such an anti law enforcement amendment as this. I can't see a conservative trying