

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

May 15, 2003

LB 320

represented on the floor several times, a part of the entirety of this package was that the judges would forego the salary increase that apparently other employees are going to get, and this was all a part of it. Now, of course, we are compromising...further compromising the issue. So I don't have an intention to reverse course. The direct answer to your question, Senator Raikes, is, yes, the net take-home pay of a judge will decrease. That kind of visually and actually demonstrates what we were all trying to discuss in terms of detriment versus benefit. Is that responsive to your question?

SENATOR RAIKES: That is responsive, Senator, and I would direct that same question to Senator Beutler. I'm understanding that because there will be no increase in salary and because there will be a increased contribution to the retirement plan and no recognizable immediate, at least, benefits in the retirement plan that actually this would be a net reduction in salaries of judges. Is that your understanding...in the take-home pay, I'll say that, of judges. Is that your understanding, Senator Beutler?

SPEAKER BROMM: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: I think it works out that way, yes.

SENATOR RAIKES: Are you comfortable with that, Senator Beutler? You handed out some things that...is that going to put judges at a competitive disadvantage, I'll call it, in Nebraska compared to other states as far as their compensation?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator, I don't think so. In Iowa, for example, the employee contribution is 4 percent, and the employer contribution is 5.75 percent.

SENATOR RAIKES: So you're making a comparison in terms of contributions to a retirement plan. What about in terms of the total compensation, salary and fringe or extra benefits and so on?

SPEAKER BROMM: One minute.