

April 6, 1982

LB 761

to lower the morale of those whose job it is to enforce the law. I can't see a conservative breaking our tacit agreement with these employees who, Senator Petersen, risk their lives daily out there directing traffic, conducting drug investigations, operating stings that catch these vicious, dangerous criminals, who have to participate, Senator Howard Peterson, in executions when they occur. Now how in the world after putting these kind of burdens on these employees are you going to sit there as a conservative in your conservatism and suggest that we not give these people the raise that they so richly deserve. I am appalled. I am flabbergasted. I am speechless, and to prove that, I don't have anything else to say.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Schmit. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I would rise to oppose the amendment. I want to explain very clearly, if I can. As I understood the purpose of the amendment was in recognition of the revenue shortfall that we are currently experiencing. Now if you read the Tax Commissioner's letter that Senator Carsten passed out yesterday, you would understand that we are approximately fifty to fifty-four million dollars on June 30th, 1982 with a revenue shortfall and you can eliminate next year's appropriation entirely, the whole \$740 million, and you still will have a revenue shortfall on June 30th of \$50 million. So you do not address that issue by deferring an adjustment in employees' salaries. Now, true that you do have an impact on reducing those costs through to June 30th, 1983 as far as the tax rates that will be set next November but you will have absolutely zero impact, no impact whatsoever, on the necessity of making the sales tax adjustment which will be required on June 1 because of reduced revenue which has nothing...it is nothing new. It is exactly what was done in 75-76. So I would oppose the amendment on the basis that a 3.75 percent increase, annualized increase, for state employees, which is a 5 percent, October 1, is a reasonable adjustment, it is a very minor adjustment certainly from what I have read in the paper of other local entities. I believe I saw where Douglas County did 7% the other day. It seems to me that this is the wrong approach. There are amendments prepared by the committee that provides a comparable reduction in appropriations plus additional reductions to the general fund expenditures which will help. I would hope that you do not vote for this amendment on the assumption that somehow or other its adoption or for that matter the adoption of the amendment which will be following offered by the Appropriations Committee, neither, neither

10249