

about 25 years. That is how you do it. You establish a benefit. You have it prefunded. You then have an unfunded liability that you then fund and pay off over about a 25 year period. So you are talking somewhere about two to three million dollars a year in additional cost. Now it has been estimated this will be saved by lower salaries and different things and so you have got to factor that side of it into it, but in the retirement side alone, there will be an additional cost and an additional expenditure and that is an important factor to keep in mind. And, again, the precedent it sets, the fight that will come from other employees asking for a similar benefit will follow, and just in terms of the concept of early retirement, it runs counter to what we were trying to do for many years in encouraging older people to work longer, have more fruitful lives, and stay on the job if they want to stay on the job, and now we are just doing the opposite. The idea is there to get people out of work and get rid of them and get them off the job even at the age of 60 which is a very young age I think. And the biggest problem with this amendment is it goes down to 60 and 61. It goes below even 62, below social security benefits are provided, then stop at 62, and that is a concern as well. So with those concerns, I would agree with Senator Johnson and ask you to reconsider your support for LB 325.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Harris, then Senator Pappas.

SENATOR HARRIS: Mr. President, I will take just a moment. I suggest that we reject this motion, go ahead and read the bill and pass it on. The concept that there has been no compromise is not correct. We started out with the Rule of 90 concept. There was a proposal made that reduced that more than it is right now which is a Social Security concept. We ended up at this middle ground. It is going to cost the state some money now and in the future, but it has been debated and the bill was advanced on the basis that it was going to do some long-term benefits for the education system of the State of Nebraska. So I strongly urge you to reject this motion. I turn the balance of my time over to Senator Pappas.

SENATOR PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, colleagues, as Senator Harris said, this bill has been negotiated, it has been compromised. The Rule of 90 would cost more money for everybody. That is not the case in 3 percent. The original bill that had the 3 percent was 3 percent for the first five years, then 5 percent for the next five years. That has been dropped out. Also Senator Johnson is wrong when he talks about