

offers you a short-term analysis of the outcome of this measure. I don't dispute it, but I want to tell you that that is only a short-term perspective. What happens when you move from 55 down to 50 as the retirement age particularly in a program that does not have a cost of living adjustment, doesn't have a COLA? In other words people are frozen for 25 or 30 years in the benefit level they receive. Do you think that we will hear from them again? Those of you who have been around who had the teachers come down here know that when you freeze somebody for a long period of time at a defined benefit they come down and ask for additional benefits. At the age of 50 somebody who retires has a life expectancy of over 30 years. How many of you believe that people frozen at a defined benefit for 30 years will not be down here asking for more money? I don't believe it. Long-term, that's a cost. Secondly, when you take one of the better retirement systems as this is, and you make it even better, what do you set up as a chain mechanism, sort of a chain reaction from that decision? You find people using it as the yardstick of appropriate decisions in this state that they would like to hitch their wagon to in coming sessions. We will get whipsawed with other public employment groups and retirement organizations because of whatever benefits we give over and above what others receive. If you're going to get whipsawed, why would you take one of the best retirement systems you have and make it even better so that other systems which have a demonstrable need will be able to use it as an ideal and shoot for it? The second long-term downside is we will get whipsawed by other retirement groups demanding the, some kind of equity in response to the values in this system. Third, when social security was created, one out of 15 people who were part of the workforce were retired. Today that number is down to under one in six. A little after the turn of the century the number will be down in one in four which means that workers will be funding nonworkers on the relationship of about one to four or even less. This is a dangerous phenomenon to get into. Now Senator Hohenstein said look, if we get into trouble, we can just ask the patrol to put in more money in the future because right now we're overfunded at 115 percent. We're not going to stay at 115 percent with amendments like this, but will that happen? Will we simply ask the patrol to put more money in if we get into trouble? No. We now ask an exact split, 8 percent and 8 percent between the state and the patrol. The day comes when we need more money for Senator Hohenstein's proposal, we're not going to take it just out of the proposal, we're going to reach into the General Fund...