

And we didn't ignore this issue. The Retirement Committee didn't ignore this issue. What we did was ask for an Attorney General's Opinion and we got one. What the Retirement Committee did, myself excluded, was reject it. That's what they did and went out and hired another attorney and got a differing opinion from the Attorney General's Opinion. And so PERB went out and hired another attorney and got a differing opinion from the opinion from the attorney that we hired, the Retirement Committee hired, that was different from the Attorney General. So there are three attorneys' opinions here. We have the Attorney General's Opinion that is being followed right at this point by the state of Nebraska and the Retirement Board, and everybody involved as far as I can see is happy with that, feels that that is a resolution, the best resolution. We have the opinion of the Retirement Committee attorney that was hired by Senator Wickersham or the Exec Board, and that was different from the Attorney General's Opinion, came after the Attorney General's Opinion, a different opinion. Then PERB went out and hired an attorney, Mr. Clatterbuck, and that was different than his opinion. So if we want to go out and hire another expert's opinion and you want to agree to do that, that's fine with me. I'll take another opinion in here. But the problem is we've asked the Attorney General of the state of Nebraska to give us an opinion on this. He has told us that this is the way that we should handle this. PERB is handling that this way, and the Retirement Committee, myself excluded, rejected that. They want to go to the Supreme Court and get...not only do they want to go to the Supreme Court, they want to go to the Supreme Court to get the exact same opinion that the Attorney General gave them. That's what they want to do. And I'll read just from the testimony of Mr. Clatterbuck. It said, it would be better to clearly address the legislative concerns by administration, corrective legislation if need be, correct that legislation. In the administration of a large public retirement system there's bound to be mistakes. A mistake has been made. That's what occurred, and it's at a minimum we think these issues should be addressed only if a true case or controversy involved an aggrieved party or a school district brought the action. This issue should not be brought out and litigated in a case where the state is suing itself. That's what we're doing in 343. The state is going to sue itself. We're going to go to the Supreme Court, we're asking our Attorney General to say that we made a mistake and that's what they're going to come to that logical conclusion that we made a mistake. What else comes out of this