

this amendment at this time. First of all, on the map, the reason for that, Senator Nelson, is it's only 10 months the first year, we start September. So it isn't a full year and that's the reason it's somewhat less than double. It wasn't an error. I appreciate the chiding. I don't mind that, but it was because it was only 10 months out of the first year, approximately. I consider this...we have discussed this and I would like to go for the full 40 the second year, the second level. The reason is that, you see, '74 to '94 is a full 20 years and we probably could have as much as an 18 to 20 percent increase in the next three years of the consumer price index which adds another 20 onto my presently 104 percent. So it seems like if it's going to be realistic at all, I don't think that 40, in reality, is that far out of line. That's simply my thought. If the rest of you don't see it that way, that's fine, but I'm willing to go for the full 40 simply because I think it's fair. I think that in lieu of the cost of baby-sitting services, for example, parking services, it's been estimated by my Clerk of the District Court that approximately 30 to 40 percent are self-employed or "unemployed", not necessarily unemployed but at least are not working a full-time job, are involved in this. So there's no chance for reimbursement of them from an employer, in this case. You take a chance of a trucker, for example, that's called in, perhaps only has to go in on a Monday but he loses a full week's work many times because of the way his load schedule is. So even though it's a modest amount of money from an income standpoint, it does represent some help for those jurors that are needed. And I think 40, in this day and age, particularly by 1994 is not unrealistic. And so I would oppose this amendment.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Is there anyone else who wishes to speak to the amendment? If not, Senator Robak.

SENATOR ROBAK: Thank you, Madam Speaker and members, I have a bill that I'm going to introduce myself and it has not had a hearing date yet and it's reimbursing for child care for jurors. And i have heard truckers addressed and everybody else's concerns addressed but we really do have valid concerns that we're excluding a lot of important people from jury duty because they cannot afford to pay their child care fees and the services for child care and, therefore, they cannot be serving on juries. And I think we're overlooking a real good part of the people that would serve on juries. How do you feel about including fees for child care services?