

you could cut this bill in two parts and preserve the part that increases the maximum benefit for those well-paid employees, then I say again you might could justify putting them in the managed care program and restricting their right to choose a physician by saying you're getting something for what you're giving up. Then, on the other side, we have the throwaways who are not making that much money but who are losing benefits under this bill and we say we'll take care of these that we're trying to help now. Since they're going to be in the managed care part of the program there will be some savings if, in truth, savings are to come. There should be some diminution in the amount of increase in the premiums because you're dealing with 48 percent of the workers and, for the throwaways, we don't throw them away. We just put them in a holding action and keep them where they are, but we don't make things worse for them. We're not going to increase their monetary benefits and we're also not going to deprive them of rights that they have when it comes to selecting a physician or obtaining medical care. We'll at least hold them harmless. But that's not what this bill does. Let me ask Senator Landis a question. Senator Landis.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Landis, would you respond, please?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Would you be willing...

SENATOR LANDIS: Yes, that's "Senator Wildebeest" to you, Senator Chambers. Thank you.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: (Laugh) Senator Landis, would you be willing to help me perform that delicate surgery? Look at this as Siamese twins, one strong and well-nourished and the other sickly. We're going to separate them and allow the well-nourished one to kind of make it on his or her own while we hold this weak one harmless and try to nurture them and deal with them next year to try to increase some kind of benefit in return for what they're giving up.

SENATOR LANDIS: I understand that nature of the question. I can tell you this. I have done for myself the weighing of the benefits and the losses, and there are some of each, and the ethics of the bill and I am comfortable in the form that it is now. The answer is that, no...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That means "no".