

matter of practice, if an agency that was say a constitutional office wanted to upgrade salaries because of a job classification system, we would always ask the State Personnel System to go in and evaluate. And if they did, and if they found that those positions should be upgraded in salary because of a job, it used to be pretty much automatic that it was approved in the budget for any agency, but we rather religiously held to that approach. And what concerns me about the bill here is as I've argued conceivably, if you think that is mandated, I suppose you could say that the court would be mandated to do it, without the salary, then their option is to lay people off to fulfill it, or come in with a deficit and the thought occurred to me as I was sitting here, I would not have a problem if next year, if the State Personnel System has reviewed these positions of certainly adding into the deficit bill for the current fiscal year, the salary adjustments that would reflect what that pay classification system would be. But I have another concern and this was the reason I put up the kill motion, or the...yeah, it is a kill motion. And that is that I have a lot of reservations that the Legislature begins to circumvent the pay classification system even though it does not apply to constitutional offices, but in the long run if we start making adjustments, it is inevitable that you will have a pay system that is out of kilter. And I can tell you that it happened that way before. The reason the State Personnel System was adopted in 1965 was to avoid having inconsistent salary wages for like employees in different agencies. And the story that I have in this whole process does not apply to constitutional officers, at least when I was there we used it. The story I hear in the progress of this whole issue has been a little different than what I've heard here this afternoon. I don't know the story first hand, but I would strongly support next session, in a deficit bill, that the State Department of Personnel has reviewed those positions, that those salaries be adjusted because I believe very strongly in an integrity of a pay classification system. I believe very strongly you've got to treat agencies like decisions uniformly, but my problem with this bill is it does not say by whom and I don't know how it was to be implemented. And you could not constitutionally force the court to have their positions reviewed by the state personnel system for classification, but in a matter of practice you can. And so for those reasons I put the motion up to indefinitely postpone. I don't want to take a lot of time, but if somebody wants to speak they can, otherwise I'll withdraw it and vote no and save some time.