

Now the dignity of the Legislature on some of these points is at stake. Why is this particular one sucker bait? Because, number one, it is a complex issue that the public never really understands. You can't go out right now into a group of people, explain the complexity of this particular insurance thing and so you get down to number two, all you have to do is say, "Well this could have involved millions of dollars, of future state expenditures that were stopped." Number three, it has a beautiful constituency, public employees. It has got all the elements and it was typical of the vetoes that were deliberately designed to be overridden for political purposes, Marge Higgins, which is where we are back to full circle. Do you remember the famous veto over at the Ag campus? After we spent multimillions building the building then they vetoed the money to hook up the water and sewer. Now what did the Legislature do? We said, well shoot, you can't have a building without pottys and sinks and so on and so forth that we've got in there and that water has to go somewhere, we have to do the responsible thing and override the veto because we are responsible people. Same time of thing, sucker bait, to start setting the precedent of using and abusing a group of people in here and I just urge you not to be part of a new crop that is harvested. I urge you to reject it, besides that, it is a bad bill.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I just wanted to remind you of a couple of points that haven't been made real quickly. First of all, at the federal level and now hopefully at the state level, we are beginning to recognize that the demographics have changed, we are beginning to recognize that we are relying on fewer and fewer workers to support larger and larger numbers of retired people and we are beginning to react to that in a number of ways in order to make some fiscal sense out of the whole situation and, of course, one of the ways at the federal level we are doing it is to begin to think about and to extend the retirement age and try to do everything to encourage people to work as long as they are able to work. And I think that this particular bill goes directly contrary to that trend and goes directly contrary to what makes good sense and will make good sense the next five, ten, fifteen, twenty years. So for that reason because it creates a disincentive to keep working, that is the reason that I have opposed the bill all the way along. Now the comment was made, changing the emphasis just a little bit, the comment was made that if these people aren't helped, well they will just go on welfare. Well, the point is I think that the people who would be helped by this particular bill