

desk job. There are a lot of us in here who would not fit that caliber, there are a lot of officers who would not fit in that slot. So you can stand here today and talk about saving \$2 million 30 years from now when, in effect, you might, in the first place, lose it in the next few years because of the investment you make in a man that you've trained and who decides, for one reason or another, to quit. But most important is the one argument which Senator Luedtke offered and that is that an officer would stay on after 30 years and do a desk job, not that he wouldn't do the best job that he could, but not the job for which he was trained and which he served. I would like to suggest there are a lot of jobs that, as you grow older, you cannot perform as well. That happens. Then you try to find some system where-by the retirement takes care of them, or some other hiring provision takes care of them.

PRESIDENT: One minute, Senator.

SENATOR SCHMIT: I don't know how many of these people will, in the future, come on at 21 years of age. Not that many. I know the argument that Senator Dworak presents is a good one, it's a tempting one. But, just like the boiler that blew up, you can stand here today and talk about saving \$2 million and maybe in 5, 10, or 20 years you're going to spend ten times that amount of money, Senator Dworak and myself, none of us will be here, but the liability will be there. So I ask you to reject the Dworak amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator Clark.

SENATOR CLARK: Mr. President, I'd ask for the previous question.

PRESIDENT: Do I see five seconds? I see five seconds? The question then is shall debate now cease. Record your vote. Have you all voted? Record.

CLERK: 26 ayes, 4 nays to cease debate.

PRESIDENT: Debate ceases. Senator Dworak.

SENATOR DWORAK: Mr. President, colleagues. My points that I brought up in my opening are the same. It appears, as Senator Schmit admitted, that nobody really knows whether this is going to improve or not improve retention. I think we pretty well concluded that, 400 applicants to fill 30 jobs, we don't have a recruitment problem. So it appears to me that if we don't know, if we're shooting in the dark, it's a foolish way to spend \$2 million. You know if you throw enough crap against a wall some of it may stick. I don't think that is the way Senator Schmit makes his business decisions, nor do I think that is the way he votes on the vast majority of legislation in this particular body. We just can't throw money out hoping that some of it might do some good without knowing if it's going to do any good or not. We've been very good with the State Patrol. In fact, I noticed last year, it's been brought to my attention that the unfunded liability showed an increase of \$3,469,000, or about 53.1 percent, this is for the State Patrol alone. Fifty-three point one percent of unfunded liability last year. I also know that the state matches the employee contribution of 8 percent of salary. This has increased from 75-76, for the State Patrol, from \$558,000 to \$666,000. So it's not like we haven't been taking