

about when we're talking about welfare reform and transition and offering all these other things. You're talking about giving them more child care, you're talking about giving them more education, you're talking about job training, all these other areas where we're expanding to transition that individual to a job and now you're saying, well let's give them more money. Well, to me, that is a disincentive. That is a disincentive for people because what we should do when we get down or to the point of the final vote on welfare, if you want to call this reform, is take all these things and put them together and I think the papers did that at one time, but we need to do it again after you make their changes or don't make the changes, whatever we end up with, and compare that to the amount of money that it actually breaks down to with food stamps and health care and child care and all these other areas that you're giving to these individuals and how much is that translated into the dollars and bring it into the private sector and the jobs. And I think this past summer I think something came out, but it was like \$23,000, and I keep hearing on the floor a living wage, a living wage, a living wage and we were saying if...before tax dollars it would have to be like a \$17 an hour job or something now. We're really getting out of the idea that we're reforming these programs to transition people to work and, to me, that's the kindest thing you can do. Giving them more money within the system itself as the amount that we give them as a base here is not the direction that I understood we were going in last year or that I hope that we will go in this year and I hope people will vote in opposition to the Chambers amendment. First of all, we don't know how much it's going to cost again and I hate to, gosh, I hate to keep bringing up something like cost here. I know...but I think it's probably...

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR WITEK: ...what we're here for is probably to consider the cost and I think this will be a tremendous increase in cost. And then again you're tying it to something that has no end and it can go on again forever and ever and we will not have, unless we come back in and make a determination, but it's one of those things that will just keep going on and on and finally it will hit us in ten years and we'll go, wow, is this how high this has gotten to be? So I hope you'll vote in opposition to the Chambers amendment and start getting in the direction of transitioning into a job instead of beefing up these areas of what I consider a subsidy. Thank you.