

enough money and invested it, then they would be making money on that money, which, as you said, should have been the states. So we're not just dealing with the amount that was withheld, but they're using the money to make additional money. Is that possible?

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: I believe they would do that, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So they would be getting a bonus that is not specifically mentioned in the bill, and any interest that they made would not be deducted from the total amount they would be allowed to...

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: That's right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Wickersham, I'm glad that you brought this amendment. And, as he said, I wouldn't expect any less from him, once he has done it. But prior to his having done it, I didn't expect this much of him, because it hadn't even occurred to me. This is why it's good that you have people with differing interests looking at these bills. They are complex, they go into a lot of different areas. And, Senator Wickersham, I'm one of those kind of people who doesn't think of everything and I might be a little slow, like the little train trying to go to the top of the hill, but once I get to the top and can get over, then I'll probably go down the hill as fast as anybody else. So I can understand what it is you've presented to us. And I'm going to ask Senator Brashear, now, a question, if I may. Senator Brashear.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Are you opposed to this amendment?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: I am.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Would you mind telling me why you're opposed to it?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Not at all. I believe, first of all, that the amendment is premised upon a mistaken assumption that the employer, from day one, withholds the withholding in some fund unattributable to the public. The fact is that the employer must file an application, must come to a contractual agreement