

amendment. I would just as soon that we would wait until my amendment would be brought up after this and approve it. I think it's a much more fair amendment to the patrolmen. And I think since we would be taking out the early retirement that this way we would still be giving them a little something for their years of service. So I would just as soon that we did not approve this amendment, but wait until mine comes up. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Nelson, followed by Senator Haberman.

SENATOR NELSON: I think I've explained the amounts and the amendment. And, if you followed through on my figures about exactly what I'm talking about, and I'm just simply trying to be as fair as I can in all of the retirement, and I feel that 75 percent of an amount like that is getting a little bit strong. That is simply it, \$3,000 a month and 75 percent, you know what that figures out to be, 22,500...or 21,000 I guess, 500 a month, or 21...well, \$30,000 a year, put it that way, then becomes a 21...and it's just simply that I see it as opening up the door from one pension to another. There are no pension systems here, that I know of, that allow a spouse, particularly...and where I did have the problem was, as you know, the second marriage or so on and then for a pension in that size a pension. I'm not trying to distinguish between women or anyone else, I just see this as again as I've seen along. Some of the pensions are very, very good pensions here, and how long we can stand to afford that, I'll leave it up to the body. But I am much more comfortable with Senator Schellpeper's amendment.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Haberman, please.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Mr. President, members of the body, I hate to carry this debate on. May I ask Senator Nelson a question?

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Nelson, please, would you respond.

SENATOR NELSON: Sure.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Senator Nelson, does a State Patrolman draw any social security?

SENATOR NELSON: No, he does not, in most cases...