

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

May 24, 2005

LR 12

amendment yesterday. And it does just one thing. It strikes \$18,000 and inserts \$21,000. It retains the CPI. Now, I got into my office this morning, and the first thing that I was handed was an e-mail from a constituent who says: I was very disappointed to see the \$18,000 amendment yesterday...or, today, he says. I have to admit that I do not know yet what the majority of the voters believe, but I strongly believe that \$24,000 was a minimum to which the salary should be lifted. Most of you do much more than the \$12,000 you are paid entitles us to. With term limit problems on the horizon, we need to do all that we can to attract quality candidates. And without a hefty increase, I do not believe enough good men and women can be drawn into candidacy. I won't go on with the rest of it, which is kind of flattering, incidentally. Maybe I should read it. But it made me start thinking anew about what we had done yesterday. I believed yesterday that \$18,000 was too low. And I had my staff prepare a little chart for you which shows legislative salaries adjusted for inflation. And according to the inflation calculator, what \$12,000 bought in '88 would be...and it doesn't say that in here; it should have. But it would be around \$19,400-and-some in 2005. Well, I went ahead and projected out to the year 2007, which is when anything that we did would take effect. I did it at the 4 percent inflation and at the 3 percent inflation. And you can see, in 2007 it's either \$21,000 or \$20,657, which is certainly above the cost of inflation. In fact, right now, we are below the cost of inflation as compared to the '88 salary increase at \$12,000. If you project it on out to 2009, which is the very soonest date that anything could change, you get almost \$23,000 at the 4 percent inflation rate, and almost \$22,000 at the 3 percent inflation rate. That is why I really firmly believe that \$18,000 is not sufficient. It does not keep up with inflation at all. And that's assuming that the \$12,000 was the right figure 17 years ago. It may or may not have been. But Senator Stuhr and I thought that we would offer this as a compromise, let's say, between the \$24,000 and the \$18,000 in her amendment, and see what you thought. Now, I have an amendment ready to go, should this one fail, that would take us simply back to the original bill, which would be at \$24,000. Either way that we go on this, I can live with it. I think either one is good. But I happen...tend to think that the CPI factor we ought to think