

least in a token way, to maintain that standard of living. I don't usually like to take one group and give them a benefit and not do it for other groups. So that is one thing I said before on this bill. If this is a concept that you don't like then I guess that is something you have to decide. It is a concept I do like and I support it for this group, but I'll support it for all the groups. I think if you like it for this group, I would hope you would support it for other groups because it is only fair that when you have a retirement benefit you provide it to all the retirees, or else you are discriminating between them. One of the things we try to do is not allow for that in our retirement principles. So keep that in mind. You know that is probably the case, if one group does get a benefit others will want it. But in this case I think it is justified. I do think that a 1 percent adjustment is something that we'll eventually go to, it is something that is worthwhile, and is something that I think is a fair way to treat our retirees. So for that reason I would support maintaining it in the bill, but with the cautions I've raised before, that you have to understand the implications, but those are implications I understand and accept, and hope you will as well.

PRESIDENT: Senator Beutler, I guess you can close on your amendment.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, once again the effect of the amendment is to simply eliminate that portion of the bill that grants to the Omaha teachers a cost of living adjustment of 1 percent per year automatically. Just to give you...and once again it is the precedent that I am most concerned about. To give you at least some idea of the scale of the precedent, you might take a look at LB 567. LB 567 is the bill that Senator Wesely referenced with regard to allowing a COLA increase for five of the retirement systems that are in the system right now. That bill has a fiscal note attached to it of \$4.5 million of state money, and another \$1.5 million of other funds, and that is just for a 1 percent increase for a maximum of ten years for five of the 11 systems. So we are talking about, obviously, considerably more bucks than \$6 million if we are talking about doing this for all of our systems, a lot more. I'm not suggesting to you that we should be hard on those people who have already retired and who have been ravaged by the inordinately high inflation of