

like that. Again I got no statistical data, alternate program, so on and so forth. Got no information on anything really other than he's mad at me and the Governor for some reason. Then Senator Dworak, my good friend, Senator Dworak, his arguments went something like this. He used standard speech number 7 which starts out, well, the well-heeled lobbyists and the well-heeled people special interests. Incredibly enough, Senator Dworak, and this is going to blow your mind, that is the problem with the bill. They have got no special interest working it. They have got no lobbyist doing a doggone thing. It is not quite like, well, public radio, for example, where you had special interests and well-heeled lobbyists, or the insurance industry that has the strongest lobbyists, or the banking industry, all of which I expect he is slightly familiar with. It is not like any of them. This is one of those programs that has got nobody doing anything for it and that is probably why it is where it is now. What does the amendment do? Well the amendment is real terrible. It says, hey, before we throw out the baby with the bath, throw out all inspection and just say, to heck with it, before we hang the guy, we see if some of the things that have never been presented on the floor, such as are there alternate programs that have worked, or would be more workable? What are the specific defects in this program that we can identify and document and could they be corrected or should they? Is there any safety? What is the relative cost to benefit ratio? Not one of these things has been provided to us either in committee or all the stages on the floor. We don't know a thing about what we might do as an alternative, or we don't even know how really bad this might be. It may be worse than anybody thinks. So all I am suggesting is that the Governor, if you want to use the other side of the coin, you can say, we're boxing him in. You say, we're benefiting. Well we may be boxing him in. He has to provide us the documentation on any alternate programs he has. Now I guess I don't think that is the most unreasonable thing. I don't think it is so unreasonable to say, we get that information and if based upon what it is we make another look in January, that doesn't mean that we won't go ahead and repeal it because the repealer is in here. I am keeping all that. We are repealing it. We are giving it a few more months and I say a few more because the way the bill is written you have got to get 33 votes to get the E clause, otherwise you've got a delay of multimonths anyway. So we are delaying it just a few more months and gathering some data. And to me, that doesn't mean I am a pawn of the Governor, or he is a pawn of me, or that I am Popeye or Wimpy, or that all the people involved in the program are hired thieves. It just means we kind of look and see what