

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

May 15, 2003

LB 320

SPEAKER BROMM: One minute.

SENATOR STUHR: ...are different because it would take some time to phase this increase in. It wouldn't be the total \$390,000, as it is indicated on that second year. Does that help you? The column...the left-hand column was the committee amendment; the right-hand column is the Brashear amendment.

SENATOR RAIKES: Okay, Senator. Now the...Senator Brashear mentioned the judges that have been judges for more than 20 years. I think would those be inactive judges if the other ones are active, or however you described that? More than...go ahead.

SENATOR STUHR: There is no limit on the number of years that they can serve. However, anyone serving over 20 years did not pay any...or does not presently pay any compensation...I mean increase, yes, contribution.

SPEAKER BROMM: Time.

SENATOR STUHR: Excuse me.

SENATOR RAIKES: Thank you. Thank you, Senator.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Raikes, Senator Stuhr. Senator Beutler, followed by Senator Bourne.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Bromm, members of the Legislature, I appreciate everybody's effort to clarify what's happening in this bill. With regard to the employee, or the judges', contribution, remember that contribution was in the original committee bill, was in the original committee bill and was destined to go for the payment of this deficiency that was also being paid for out of an increase in court fees. So in the original committee bill, employee contribution contributed to part of that deficiency and so did court fees. So when you come to new benefits, there's nothing there from the employee for the new benefits is one way of looking at it, and I think actually a correct way of looking at it. And the amount of those employee benefits are not...the amount of contribution, the extra dollar,