

granting the waivers. It's very specific in that granting of those waivers what we must do and the evaluation part that must be in place in order to meet those federal guidelines. And so if we change the date and we go ahead, that's just fine, but what we're doing is really delaying, as Senator Beutler indicated, getting to the heart of the bill. And if we want to spend our time talking about evaluating and establishing another committee to do another evaluation, we can do that if that's going to make us feel better. It's really not going to do anything that improves the delivery of the system or increases what we'll know in the end because that evaluation piece is already in place. So I would vote for the Bernard-Stevens' amendment but then plan to vote down the amendment just because we don't need it.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Bohlke. Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Madam President, and members of the body, thank you, Senator Eohlke. I disagree somewhat with Senator Bohlke, not on the portion she said she would support the Bernard-Stevens' amendment, I like that portion of it, but the other part. And I wanted to clarify a couple things that I probably should do and may do on a substitution or on a later amendment. Senator Crosby's amendment before us, there's been some confusion. I think the confusion is that she wants to delay the entire welfare reform act one year. And if you read the amendment she has before us, maybe I'm reading it incorrectly, if you agree with the amendment, it actually would delay implementation only three months. And I don't see any advantage of doing it three months so I'll probably move to strike that section as well. But even if the Crosby amendment were agreed to in its present form, it would say the act would begin on January 1, 1996. This bill doesn't have the emergency clause, so, assuming this bill passes on Final Reading in June when we adjourn, it takes three months before it will become law. So we have June, July, August, September, I assume, before it can become law. And so then you say, well, if we delay the actual implementation to July 1st or January 1st, September, October, November, December, three months. So the delay she's talking about is not a year's delay, it is practically a three-month delay is all. Personally, I think we should go ahead and if we're going to do it, we do it, we don't need to delay just three months, I don't think that's worth doing. However, where I disagree a little bit with