

and that is with the judges retirement bill that the cost of the retirement liability will be based on the increased salaries as opposed to a change in the plan by itself right now. So it is one extra step removed from it. This is simply a change in the retirement plan and the only reason why it isn't showing a fiscal impact is because there is a reserve there, as there is in the judges retirement plan, too. So I would say you make a very good point, that both of those things are going to have liabilities come to us. It is just, and I am not necessarily trying to talk against the bill. All I am trying to say is that if we are passing a bill thinking that we are going to have no fiscal impact, this bill did not get near as much discussion on the floor that maybe it should have with the one exception of the 25-year provision which was taken out. Now I have been told by a very astute person who watches us very closely and who has an interest in it that possibly the \$5.4 million that I referred to earlier for a fiscal impact was amended out, and it is my understanding that that is not correct. That actually with the 25-year provision in there we were looking at somewhere around a \$13 million fiscal impact, and that when we amended out the 25-year provision, we didn't take this down to no hit. It is still going to be a \$5.4 million hit. Now it could be very well that all of us, or the majority of us on this floor want to pass this retirement bill with those kinds of changes that are going to make this retirement package much more beneficial to the State Patrol and their survivors and wives, widows, children, and that is very possibly what we want to do. The only thing I was trying to point out is that, if we are doing it, let's at least know that there is going to be a significant impact that will be a financial obligation to the state in the next year, two, three, depending upon the things we talked about earlier, the investments of the reserve, but it is going to be a hit. And a lot of times we do things out here on this floor that have no fiscal impact when we do them, but they certainly do have a fiscal impact that comes back to see us later. And those who serve with me on the Appropriations Committee are only too aware of these kinds of things that happen to us that become obligations to which we have no choice but to fund in later years. So as you are voting on this, and I realize that we are not going to vote on this on Final Reading today, but we will again soon, and as you are voting on this, I just want you to understand that we are asking the state to take an additional liability on, and we will be making additional contributions to the State Patrol Fund, as we may in others, but just be aware of it.