

were talking about the uniform retirement bill, and as I recall the debate and I want you to correct this for me, as I recall the debate you said that you started out with a fairly good bill and everybody liked the concept, but the first ones to come in were the judges and asked that they be exempted, and then you went through a list of others. I don't know if that was just by accident that you offered the first ones to be exempted were the judges or whether that was on purpose. Could you...was that, in fact, the first group to be exempted and can you can tell me why they wanted to be exempted?

SENATOR LEWIS: Well, Senator Newell, that is an excellent question and I appreciate you asking it at this time. The judges and others wanted to be exempt because of the nature of the way they did business. As you recall, I was using that example as a talk in terms of uniformity. But 66 2/3 is a consistent figure that we have always talked about in the committee and have for six or seven or eight years, and I am not sure the judges were the first in or the first out. I know that you want to vote on this amendment on the basis of its merit, and I think that this is probably the way to approach all of them if we are going to put a limit on them including Social Security and retirement.

SENATOR CLARK: Is there any further debate? If not, Senator Lewis, do you wish to close?

SENATOR LEWIS: Well, Mr. President, I appreciate Senator Murphy giving his kill motion in discussing my amendment, and I appreciate Senator Murphy's tendency to exaggerate and that may be because it is St. Patrick's Day and I would ask Senator Murphy to supply me with the figures that the year that will make this system actuarially sound is 2500. Obviously that is not true and obviously that is inconsistent with the way Senator Murphy usually debates on this floor because we know he is all full of truth and seriousness. The system is sound. The 66 2/3 is not an arbitrary figure picked from anywhere. All disability policies that I know of are figured on the basis of 66 2/3 because they assume at that level that you have taken into consideration other items of deductibility. I think 66 2/3 is a set pattern, not only for the judges, but for others in terms of levels that we should have for retirement. To reach 66 2/3 is not common for every judge. Many, many judges come on the bench and I invite Senator Murphy to look at the facts if he would like to, although that is not necessary for him to debate as most of you have known over the years. But if he would like to look at the facts, most of them come