

**SPEAKER NICHOL:** Okay, the question is the advancement of the bill. Senator Wesely.

**SENATOR WESELY:** I would rise, Mr. Speaker and members, in opposition to advancement of LB 325. I am passing around right now, as soon as we get it copied off, figures on the cost of this proposal. I again emphasize to you that we are talking about close to \$5 million in terms of either property tax or teacher contributions to the system on an annual basis to pay for the provisions of LB 325. There will be \$150,000 cost to the state. I assume there will be an A bill attached to this bill to pay for that amount. The proposals that were offered by myself and Senator Johnson and some others to provide a less costly alternative were rejected but they would have cut the cost probably about in half under both the plans that were proposed. I am submitting to you that despite the strong support from a number of interests involved in education in the state that this is the wrong approach of providing compensation for teachers. I think that there are preferable means in which to help the problems that we have in education. I have long supported increased teacher salaries, teacher stipends, increased state aid to education. These are the ways in which we can have a better benefit than an early retirement plan, which I think is counter to the long term best interests of our state and have felt that way for a long time. I would ask your consideration then for those of you who have expressed concern about this bill to vote against it. Now, that is not without recognizing that perhaps there is a middle ground which we can find that we can feel a little more comfortable with. I have offered a couple of ideas. Maybe there are some more out there. But if the bill is held up and not advanced to Final Reading, it seems to me that there would be a chance to negotiate again the issue. I also recognize that many of you have given a commitment on the bill and probably the votes are there, but nevertheless, I ask you in good conscience to think again about the proposal. Many of you now have on your desk the highlight of the estimated cost of this proposal. What it shows is under the 3 percent reduction we are talking about 150,000 from the state, 2.37 million from the schools and 2.37 million from the school teachers, and that is in addition to what we now have which is a full actuarial reduction. And so there is no cost in the early retirement aspect of the current plan. I have also listed for you the