

like, I mean it is supposed to look like we are trying to ameliorate the problem for the construction industry and, in fact, we are not. We are not ameliorating the problem. What we are doing is we are saying, "Well, we are going to kind of phase it in so it hurts you a little bit this year, a lot next year, and the year after, depending on whose figures are correct, it will kill you, maybe, if we have the right figures. And if we don't have the right figures it may only hurt you real bad", and if anybody understands just exactly what the impact is going to be, I would like them to speak and explain it to us because I think it is important that we know that. So if we accept the Maresh amendment, what we are saying is that we are going to get stuck in the neck but to what extent is the construction industry going to get stuck in the neck no one knows. But they are going to get stuck in the neck and it is going to look like we got a compromise or look like we have got some sort of agreement on this thing which obviously I think from the testimony and from the people speaking, et cetera, we do not have. We have the multiplier which Senator Stoney pointed out was used once and then dropped because it didn't work real well and that is exactly what this compromise is going to end up being because it hasn't been totally analyzed. It is going to be something that has been used for awhile and then we are going to come back in and we are going to say "Remember the compromise we passed. Well, we have to make some additional amendments." I mean Senator Maresh came to me and said, "Senator Newell, you ought to put your name on this bill. It does tremendous things." And I said, "Well, explain them to me." And he did and I understood some of it and he said, "This is the compromise we should go with", and now he has offered an amendment to his compromise. It is all or nothing he told me but now we have an amendment to this compromise because it can't be all or nothing and it isn't satisfying anybody because it really says we are going to phase in the pain and sorrow that is going to be created here and no one still knows what the total impact is going to be. I would urge this body to oppose the Maresh amendment. I think we need to look at this whole question. I think we need to look at this over a period of time. We need to see if we can get some agreement from the industry and the department and the individuals involved in terms of what the cost and what the fiscal impact is going to be on these employers. We need to get that information pretty well locked down so that when we make a decision, when we make this kind of policy decision on this floor of this Legislature, we have some assurances that we know what is going to happen. This amendment doesn't do that. This bill really doesn't do that either and for that reason I think we ought not confuse the issue by adding this amendment.