

stating everything just exactly the way it is. He comments that the Legislature is the only agency that is capped like that, and I guess I would disagree with that, Senator Chambers. That was a policy that the Exec Board makes. The Exec Board makes that decision. Now, we have a PSL, just like any other state agency, and other state agencies, I mean other constitutional officers, by the way they manage their office, they have differing pay scales, and different sorts of movement, either up or down the pay scale. I mean that is by management decision. They don't have any more or any less flexibility than we do. We have a PSL number, just like Secretary of State does, the State Treasurer. Obviously, by policy the Exec Board employees, as you mentioned, can be frozen into a place, but that is not because they're any different, that's only because the Executive Board, by management decision, chose to operate that way. I mean so you're...the answer is probably, yes, that an employee working some place else may be able to transfer up in pay grade, but that's not the only thing unusual about that, it's our Exec Board, given the amount of dollars we have in past years, that's the pay policy we've adopted. So we could change that, but you wouldn't need to change the money to change that, obviously. And so by our own decisions we treat our employees differently than everybody else, but we're not treated any differently in the budget because of that. And I would argue that, you know, that's something we could change. The cap...we have the same cap as anybody else does, we have the same personal service limitations cap, there's a dollar amount in there for X number of employees as there is in other constitutional offices, but we choose, because we are tightly budgeted, we say each senator is entitled to so much money for...and such a pay grade for such employees. But that is unusual and because we choose to make it that way. Now Senator Chambers had referenced the press, how this appears in the press. And I guess, you know, that is something to consider, obviously. But for me it's just...it's consideration of fairness to other employees in this same bill. Obviously this...we chose not to fully fund even the bargained agreement and the university, and those differences will have to be made up by tuition. Our state employees, and as in any employee group there are good...many, many good ones, and there are probably a few bad ones, yes. But, nevertheless, you know, we do not fully fund their negotiated salary agreement as well. And as far as our own employees, we treated them the same as all the state employees, plus this much more. The biggest concern I have out of all is not so much...obviously I have concern when it comes to money, the same concern as other vetoes, what we