

people as a necessary part of any substantive job. The best evidence of that was two weeks ago. In U.S.A. Today they had a nationwide poll of what things Americans believe individuals are entitled to as an absolute right as opposed to a privilege, such things as telephone service, such things as right to a college education, and a variety of other things were not perceived by a majority of the American public to be absolute rights. They were privileges, believe it or not. The one thing that above and beyond everything was perceived by the American public as a right, a necessary part, therefore, of a job was, believe it or not, a reasonable pension plan or retirement plan in conjunction with that job. There are other reasons. For example, the Nebraska Legislature, according to the information provided by our political science department, has the highest turnover of any Legislature in the United States. One has to question whether that is good for the State of Nebraska and whether it is good for the continuity of the Legislature. I believe one of the fundamental reasons for the very high turnover is that the job in and of itself encompasses so much more time than is originally contemplated and becomes, in effect, a full-time job and that individuals simply when they look at the long term cannot afford to be in this job. Well, the simple answer is, well, you knew what it was before you ran. Quite correct. Quite correct. And so I am saying, create a reasonable plan so that people will know what it is before they run, make it prospective, which is what it would be in the future, and then implement it so that the job does entail what Americans consider to be a necessary part of a job, that is a reasonable retirement plan in conjunction therewith. Now I know the question is going to be raised as to the constitutionality. If ever we should get something cleared up, it is that constitutionality question. I believe it is constitutional and I would give you two overwhelming arguments that I think would be hard to refute. Number one, if we are not allowed to have a retirement plan, then it would appear there may be violations already occurring in two areas. Number one, legislative employees are part of a retirement plan, have been for some time, yet the identical constitutional language is used with respect to them as it is used with respect to legislators in our own Constitution. And if what I am proposing here is unconstitutional, which I don't believe it is, then it would seem the Attorney General should be taking action right now to overturn, stop or upset the existing legislative