

SENATOR WESELY: And the concern you have is that an officer marries and shortly thereafter dies and that spouse of a short period of time would receive, what, 75 percent of his income. And you don't think that's appropriate, is that correct?

SENATOR NELSON: I guess I have a real problem with the financial cost of it, along with, as I say, the bill has been pared back considerably than what it was to begin with, which is fine. But you name me one other retirement system where actually that is 75 percent. Most cases those spouses are working on their own, or have worked, or if the...that they would be drawing social security or pension on their own eventually. I have no problem with the 50 percent, as it currently is, the same as many other retirement systems.

SENATOR WESELY: The 75 would conform to other retirement systems, you're saying?

SENATOR NELSON: Not that I know of.

SENATOR WESELY: The 50 percent would conform.

SENATOR NELSON: The 50 percent would conform to other retirement, but not 75 percent of the annuity. You understand, and might I tell you how the much the annuity...and this is just as an example, and it would increase. Incidentally, if you take your figures, the 75 percent maximum on the annuity works out the same for 25 years or 30 years. There is no incentive for a patrolman to work the 30 years, if he has his 25 in, because it comes...a 75 percent cap means the same. The retirement in '89 was \$2,419 a month, 2,745, 2,473, 2,702, 2,616, 2,408, 1,952, 2,188, 935, 1,731, 2,806, 1,657. My whole concern is the fiscal cost of the bill.

SENATOR WESELY: Okay, I just was trying to clarify because I know we've been talking about the early retirement provisions of the bill, and I hadn't really looked at the other provisions you're highlighting now, and I appreciate you clarifying that for me, thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Schellpeper.

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. I guess I also have a little problem with Senator Nelson's