

February 1, 1982

LB 387

has before that committee an entirely new program on retirement, one that the committee will be considering and that would indirectly affect this particular legislation. And it appears to me that the committee ought to look at both matters before we vote on it here on the floor. To say that this particular matter does not have any fiscal impact upon first class cities, in spite of what Charlie Noren has put around on our desks, I would have you understand that he is taking for granted that every first class city has this fund completely funded, and those of you who know or are in the know, know there is somewhere between \$10 and \$12 million that presently is not funded by first class cities and the impact of this legislation would be that you would take this amount of money specifically out of the general fund of the city. And to me that is not a fair basis on which to approach the problem. So I just would say that I would like to see the bill referred back to the committee, but if we don't get that done, I would like then for a day's indefinite postponement motion in order that the League of Municipalities might specifically visit with some of us to tell us exactly what the impact will be on cities of the first class.

PRESIDENT: Senator Peterson, before I call on Senator Dworak who is next to speak, I have just reviewed the record on the General File history of this bill, and there has been either I believe you filed it last year a motion to indefinitely postpone which failed, which means that we cannot take that motion up again until on Select File, so just so you know where you are on that. So we are speaking to Howard Peterson's motion to return to the Retirement Committee. Senator Dworak.

SENATOR DWORAK: Mr. President, is there a motion to return, or is that.....

PRESIDENT: Yes, Senator Dworak, the motion that we are debating is to return to the Retirement Committee, that is the motion.

SENATOR DWORAK: Well, I oppose the motion to retire. I think the arguments to return the bill are shallow in the fact that any time that we have any issue come up before this body and the opponents want to stall that issue, we come up with this idea or this concept of returning the bill. So I think that is something that this body shouldn't even consider. That isn't even good strategy. I talked to these people this morning before