

retirement system rather than having the employees contribute, and they found they were not allowed to do that under the present statute. So this is permissive language. It says that the city by resolution or by proper ordinance may pass authority that they can contribute...that an employee can contribute an amount equal to, greater than, no amount of all. If they want to, they can establish a system for the city regardless of the employees contributions. So it is purely permissive language. It doesn't bother any of the existing retirement systems and it really has no affect on anything else but it just allows the cities some flexibility in establishing a retirement plan for their employees. With that, I would just urge advancement of the bill.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. If there is no further discussion, the question is the advancement of the bill. All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record, Mr. Clerk, please.

CLERK: 26 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on the advancement of 145.

PRESIDENT: LB 145 advances. LB 237, please.

CLERK: Mr. President, LB 237 was a bill introduced by Senator Goodrich. (Read title.) The bill was introduced on January 9, referred to retirement for hearing, advanced to General File. I have Retirement Committee amendments pending, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Senator Haberman on the Retirement Committee amendments.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Mr. President, members of the body, I am pleased to report that I have my file and I am ready to go on this one. The committee amendment merely adds the date of June 15th, 1989, to clarify when the increase in the formula annuity is to become effective. I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDENT: The question is the adoption of the committee amendments. All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record, Mr. Clerk, please.

CLERK: 26 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of committee amendments.