

penalty which I think makes sense because you know they don't get social security and it really could be a problem for those people if they did want to go ahead with that. But that is the compromise I am offering at this time for your consideration. I think if you want to discuss it, that is fine. On the other hand I also feel that...and I haven't had a chance to go around and talk to you about it, and I don't necessarily want to get us off track at this time. So I'm not sure whether to go ahead with that or not. I'll wait to hear what people have to say about it. But I'm trying to find a middle ground. If you can work with me on this to try and help us find that middle ground, I think we will all benefit from it.

**SPEAKER NICHOL:** Senator Pappas, then Senator Lundy.

**SENATOR PAPPAS:** Mr. Speaker, colleagues, I rise to oppose Senator Wesely's amendment. I feel that we've already achieved the middle ground or the great compromise because, if you remember a little bit, this is an amendment that removes the 90 concept, which a lot of people thought was too high. So that, in itself, moved it back down in more of a compromising position, plus the original concept of the 3 percent went a little bit further. It went 3 percent until age 60, then it went 5 percent a year down to 55. So we remove that too. So this is truly the compromise I think everybody has been looking for. I hope that we'll reject the amendment of Senator Wesely and advance this bill so we can get on with other things within the body.

**SPEAKER NICHOL:** Senator Lundy, please.

**SENATOR LUNDY:** Mr. Speaker and members of the body, it seemed to me like a lot of words have been spoken here over the past 10 days relative to this retirement plan for school employees. Many of those words are directed, in my opinion, are directed in the wrong direction. They talk about early retirement for the teachers, and I'm not against this. I'm not against early retirement for state employees at all. I just think that it should be on a...what would be considered an actuarially sound basis. By golly, we sure don't have it with these plans that have been offered to date. Senator Pappas indicates that this is a great big change in what was originally planned, and it is. But I don't think that it was the intent of this body, and I'm sure that he realized that, that the Rule of 90 would be adopted by the body. So