

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 15, 2003

LB 320

retirement system, which carries with it a responsibility and an obligation at law to fund the deficiency, so I was sharing those numbers with you and at \$1.5 million, the \$4 increase in the filing fee raises \$1.6 million. So that that...rather than that deficiency coming out of the General Fund, it would come from the filing fees. Now, having completed that section of the discussion, I'd like to make it clear I have at no time in any of my dealings on this matter ever had a judge tell me or threaten me with some kind of a lawsuit. I'm sorry. It is not the kind of thing that most people who try to do something in this area would have to be threatened with. I'm not certain you'd have to file a lawsuit. There's some relatively basic things with regard to contract and retirement and the ability to change it or modify it as it relates to vested benefits and that kind of thing. You don't have to be threatened with a lawsuit and, in most instances, intelligent people don't even have to have a lawsuit in order to know what the law requires with regard to whether or not you can take away a benefit that someone has that is vested, that is a part of contract, and there are court cases, no threat involved, there simply are court cases that say increasing cost without any additional benefit constitutes detriment and, therefore, is an abrogation of the terms and conditions of a retirement contract. That's not a threat. It's just hornbook law, so to speak. Now, into this mix, because you have all kinds of things, you've got the Retirement Committee, you've got the Judiciary Committee, you've got court fees, you've got all kinds of things, what we did was simply continue on the methodology that's been in place for decades to try to fund the retirement program out of contributions and out of filing...out of contributions by the judges and out of filing fees. That's what led us to where we are. We are increasing the judges' contribution from 6 to 8 percent. I don't know who or when put in place a provision in the judicial retirement plan that says that a judge, after 20 years, doesn't have to contribute, but clearly that needed to be changed. And so we were requiring a contribution of 4 percent from judges after 20 years of service, when they thought there would be none, and in return for that we addressed the early retirement issue now. Rather than making it 60, which the judges were requesting, we made it 62, which corresponds with the life's experience of some of the rest of us; that there are