

to get a figure on the exact amount of retirement. But also, as you notice, a good share of those that are retiring are up the scale considerably, as they should be. But here we're not taking an average of 5 years salary or so on, we're taking 3 percent early retirement benefits. And I am certainly, I guess as Senator Moore, I'm going to be looking at this very, very careful. Probably will get my car tagged when I'm going down the highway at 66, but again when we start the benefits from 8 percent to 12.9, right off that comes up to my figure, somewhere of a \$1,300 a year increase with COLA increases. So I'm just saying that this is one that I'm going to watch very careful because we're setting precedent...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR NELSON: ...for any number...group of people to come in with the same benefits. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you. Mr. President and members, I would rise in strong opposition to LB 953. I commend Senator Haberman and Senator Bernard-Stevens, I know their intent is good intentions. But I would ask you to again be aware of what you do whenever you provide for increased retirement benefits without recognizing there are implications. I think Senator Nelson tried to raise some of those issues. Twenty-five and out, you're talking about individuals now that can retire with full benefits at 46 years old. They can come into the patrol at 21 and be out at 46. Now I don't think that that is reasonable. I think that right now they're out at 30 years, that's 51. I think at 51 years old you've got the health and stamina to continue to serve in the State Patrol. Now beyond that, I still think you'd even have the ability into the later years and the fifties. I know Senator Schmit, you know, he's got that ability, he can handle it and others that are of that age bracket have the physical stamina, mental capability to serve in the patrol far into the...probably far into the sixties, maybe even into the seventies. But, nevertheless, right now, all we're asking is that they serve at least 30 years. I don't see any way in which we can justify, at this point, reducing down to 25 years and at 46 allow these people a full, early retirement. Now there is a cost to this. And, if you look at the A bill, there's a \$600,000 cost to it, it doesn't come cheap. And I think the other problem you've got always in any retirement