

precedent here and one that I think the general public is not very favorable to. I heard Senator Schellpeper talking about you've got to look at the patrolmen, and this is good for the patrolmen. Well, understandably it's good for the patrolmen. They like the bill. They want the bill. They benefit from the bill and I appreciate that. But you've got to look at the other factors. And I would say look at the taxpayer in particular. The taxpayer has to foot the bill, and the taxpayer out there, I think, is not going to be too keen on the idea of this sort of benefit being provided so far in excess of what most of those taxpayers get in terms of benefits. And I think they're going to make that judgment and say, that's not right, that's not fair. And, so looking from that perspective, I would have to ask you to oppose the bill, to not support the bill, and to let us go forward with other legislation, because this one, I think, is a problem for us that will lead to other problems in the very near future.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Nelson, please.

SENATOR NELSON: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I still have not been able to get a figure. As far as I can tell, there is probably...we're talking about 100 and altogether...patrol that have retired, 120 or something like that, or 115. And probably a third of those are retired prior to 1984. We were simply told then, no, we don't need to worry about the new retirees, their retirement will be based on an increase in salary, and they will be taken care of. Now another year or two down the road we're being asked for more and more. When you go from 8 percent to 12.9, that's dollars. I agree that the Highway Patrol, not all of them are in drug investigation, no different than that railroader out there on that train all night long. A lot of professions are having to work to 62 or 65, be glad to get that job. I see nothing wrong with the spouse of the Highway Patrol working like the rest of us work. Again, social security is involved, and I just simply think that we're going too far. And when we're talking about then the spouse, 75 percent, we're going too far, too fast, folks. I don't deny that the Highway Patrol do not do us a good service, but I don't think there is anything wrong with their compensation now, it is getting better. Again, where do we stop on these retirement benefits? Who is going to pay for those down the line? The same thing is on the federal level. Where are we going to start, and where are we going to stop? Just, to me, these benefits go too far. I just...the whole package. With that, that's all I have to