March 22, 2005   LB 739

done in this bill, there are a couple of different things that are being done. But when something is pegged to state average wages, when state average wages go up...and they go up, oftentimes, as a product of productivity, as well as inflation. That is, we're all getting richer because these various technologies make us richer. And overall, there is an enrichment of our society that's been going on almost year after year, for a long time, and very dramatically in recent years. So by virtue of pegging something to the state average wage, the beneficiaries of this system benefit by that increased productivity. But now you're starting to remove that connection, by putting in the "lesser of" language and then pegging it to last year's benefit plus $10. So there are two problems in doing that, from my perspective. One, the beneficiaries of this system that's been set up no longer benefit from productivity increases. And two, not only that, but depending on...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...what the inflation rate is, they may not even make up the rate of inflation. And down the line, with a flat dollar amount, not only they might not make up for inflation; they certainly will not make up for inflation. So you really give them a double whammy on this bill. You detach it from the productivity scale, and then you don't even make a measurement that keeps them up with inflation, much less the productivity identified as the state average wage. And I give you the rest of my time to respond to that.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Well, thank you, Senator Beutler. I guess I would be in agreement with you that in the long run the straight $10 is a problem as we get down the road several years. But you have an amendment for 3.4 percent, and I think in the short run that is probably fine, but in the long run that gets to be a problem also. So the...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM: Thank you.