

SENATOR SCHMIT: Okay. Then I'd just like to say this, it seems to me in reviewing the figures, Senator Dworak, that the turnover rate is rather high with the Patrol. It may not be exactly and completely tied to retirement or to salaries, but it is certainly, I am convinced, higher than what we would like to see in a good, solid law enforcement agency, the agency which, in this state at least, we are responsible for. I know that Senator Dworak has expressed some concern about the cost. I would agree that many times, when we establish these pension programs, we have not really funded them adequately. I would hope that we can get the information we need to keep this bill intact as has been reported by Senator Hasebroock. I think that it's very important that we treat these individuals properly. I'm not sure that the situation, as it has been explained here, is satisfactory to myself either. I believe that, before we begin to take apart the work of the committee, we should have information relative to turnover rates, because a turnover rate can be very expensive to this state. We spend a lot of money to train a man in law enforcement. If he works for us for a few years and then, because he's not satisfied with the situation with which he finds himself, he enters into some other profession. We have lost a lot more money, possibly, than we would have to provide a proper retirement program for him. Let's look at both sides of it. I would like to have some more information relative to the cost of training a man, and how long it is before we get our monies worth out of him. I think you have to look at both ends of the thing, Senator Dworak, not just the retirement cost, but what it cost to put that man in the field, and how much we get out of him before we lose him. I know there has been a significant amount of Troopers that have quit the Patrol. I know of one or two instances, particularly where I was acquainted with them, that lack of an adequate retirement program certainly was a factor. So let's take a look at both sides of it. I certainly, at the present time, support the bill. I see no reason to hold the bill up. I think we could perhaps get some more information on it.

PRESIDENT: Go ahead.

CLERK: Mr. President, amendment on the desk, offered by Senator Dworak. (Read amendment found on page 1726 of the Journal).

SENATOR DWORAK: Mr. President, colleagues. I'm also in sympathy with the strong, solid personnel program of the State Patrol as all other state employees. I do not think, however, that the fact that a man can retire at 55 or 51 can possibly be that much of an incentive in recruiting and retaining Patrolmen. I think that the cost to do this is extremely high. The current cost is on this piece of paper that Senator Goodrich passed around, or the ultimate cost. I don't have the current cost, but the ultimate cost, the ultimate liability, the ultimate debt could be \$2,109,000 just for this one benefit, not for the rest of the bill. I support the other provisions, the other three provisions of the bill which would still result in a fiscal impact of almost \$2 million. I think it makes a lot of sense, and I think we should do it. I think to double this, just to be able to retire at age 51, I think it's way too much money, it's way too expensive. I don't think that benefit has that kind of attractiveness, it wouldn't to me, and I don't think it would to most people on this floor. If you were 21, 22, or 23 years old and they were trying to hire you and they said "Look, the reason you come to work for us is because you can retire at 51 rather than 55". I don't think that