

in this bill, it just happens. This bill should be destroyed. It is a very underhanded approach to a substantial increase in pension which the committee statement makes no mention of and I would doubt very much that testimony in the committee did. But you figure it out...at \$11,000 twenty years ago, \$45,000 now, take the mean average as 35, and we are going to change that pension from a funding base of 35 to 49, and in subsequent years it will be even higher and the actuarial funding of this pension plan is going nowhere but down the tube. Now we have got to look at what we are doing with these pensions, and I think this is a fine place to start, because there is no excuse for taking the associate judges out in order to make this more actuarially sound. There is no excuse for a 30, if we adopt the amendment, 36...37 percent increase in pension in one year, and for a total lack of funding that we are going to pass on and we will shove this actuarial recovery on this bill up to about 2500, the year 2500. We are already at 2000. I don't think the taxpayers of this state are that anxious to increase the judge's pension. Senator Chambers pointed out their increase in salaries automatically increases their pension, and I for one would love to have the kind of a pension they already have.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion before the House is the Lewis amendment to the Goodrich amendment to LB 533. Senator Beutler, do you wish to speak to the Lewis amendment? Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I would accept Senator Lewis' amendment. I would also indicate that I think Senator Murphy has tried to isolate the issue for you, although I don't agree with his conclusion. But the question is, how do we decide for any group, and if you could set aside for a minute your bias about judges or your attitudes about judges but talk about any employee, whether it is a State Patrolman, whether it is a teacher, whether it is a state employee, or whatever, when we have some sort of calculation that retirement is built up a percentage every year and it is computed on some basis, what is the basis we are going to use? Are we going to use the total salary, which in the case of judges is what we are currently doing with the future judges, or are we going to use the final years of service? Now for the State Patrol we are using the final years of service, and I know there has been a lot of concern on this floor as to whether or not we are going to build consistency in our retirement systems