

to introduce it.

SENATOR WESELY: Okay. Well, I appreciate that. Again, I think before we jump into this, we have to understand, again, the implications of making decisions that improve benefits in certain areas. The base bill that Senator Day has up here deals with local firefighting units and there was a study that I don't have readily available and I hope to get a copy up here shortly that indicated that of the benefit levels in the different types of public services in the State of Nebraska the area that she targeted in this original was the one that had the lowest benefits. They were...they were definitely in need of improvement, and I'm not sure what benefit level is proposed in terms of early retirement.

SENATOR FISHER: Well,...

SENATOR WESELY: No, I'm done, Senator Fisher, in terms of the questions of you..

SENATOR FISHER: Okay. Well, let me tell you, currently,...

SENATOR WESELY: No, no, this is my time, Senator Fisher, I'm sorry. I'm done with my questions of you. I'm trying to raise a concern here about this proposal. LB 724, as I recall, dealt with, again, the target was for those retirement plans for first class cities and I will try to get a copy of the study that was done that would indicate that those...those retirement plans for those people where the least, in terms of benefits of any of the public officeholders or servants in the State of Nebraska, it needs to be improved. But here, on the other end of the spectrum, in terms of the Patrol, they have one of the better retirement systems of anybody currently in state or local government and they currently can retire at the age of 55. This, as I recall, would lower it to the age of 50. You don't just jump into this and cover your eyes and says, that's swell, let's do it. It may or may not be a good idea but this ought to have a chance to be discussed with some more time on General File and not to be amended on Final Reading because there are implications beyond the State Patrol. When you take this step you've got the police, you've got other types of plans out there that look at this and say, why should we allow for patrolmen to be retiring at the age of 50 and others have to wait till their age 65? I think there's, obviously, good reason to have some lower retirement age for those in safety, public safety, but the