

February 17, 1983

LB 210

situated to Nebraska in many regards have done away with the sex differentiated tables as a basis for discriminating against the female retirees and none have gone broke, none have experienced budgetary difficulties and the City of Lincoln is floating probably on a surplus, there is no basis for Nebraska to keep this, especially the programs for the state patrol, the judges, and there was another group I think mentioned during the hearing which do not have the sex differentiated tables and do not discriminate against their female retirees. So I am asking that you advance LB 210 to E & R Initial.

PRESIDENT: The Chair wants to make the point that in five minutes to ten we will appoint a committee to go get the Chief Justice, and there are a number of lights on to speak on this bill. The Chair recognizes next Senator DeCamp for a few minutes. Senator Pirsch.

SENATOR PIRSCH: I would have a couple of questions for Senator Chambers, if he would yield. Senator Chambers, presently every employee contributes equally. Is that correct?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Based on the salary that you are making?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

SENATOR PIRSCH: But when it comes to the other end, you are not paid equally according to your highest income?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Is that what it is?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: To state it as clearly as I can, similarly situated male and female employees pay in the same amount but when they come out on the other end, the females get a lesser monthly benefit than the similarly situated male.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Just because of the gender, not because of the lower pay scale.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No, strictly because of gender only.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Now the prediction is for \$1,615,000, the first year. Do you think that is a reasonable estimated cost for that?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: The reason I have no way of determining that