

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

May 15, 2003

LB 320

people who want to retire and probably ought to retire. I made that argument on General File. When somebody wants to, you probably want them to. Because if somebody really wants to be retired then they ought to get retired and not be staying and maybe not performing at the optimum while at the taxpayer full salary expense. So instead of making it 60, as the judges had originally proposed, we made it 62.

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: That's called compromising. And instead of providing the spousal benefit, the spousal benefit now is punitive in that it takes away, it penalizes against contributions made by the judges. So in trying to update that benefit but not be inappropriate in this atmosphere, we required the increased judicial...the judges' increased compensation now, but did commit that in the year 2005, which was then again a matter of negotiation, so deferred to 2005 would be a nonpunitive spousal retirement benefit and, in addition, no judicial salary increase. And I'll talk again about the fact that other state employees are getting a salary increase. But we said right up-front no salary...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: ...increase. So you can...you can object.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: You can...

SENATOR CUDABACK: I'm sorry. Senator Bourne, followed by Senator Wehrbein and six others.

SENATOR BOURNE: Thank you, Mr. President. Members, I can't disagree with anything that Senator Brashear has said. He's accurately dramatized the situation. I think as we discuss this, we have to remember two fundamental principles. One, the judges' retirement plan is underfunded. And we don't even have to say judges. I mean we have a very...we have a number of retirement plans: judges, state troopers, public employees. I