

are certainly those, if you talk to people that pay support, they certainly believe that there's a problem there, that the people who are prosecuting the case and then the people who are deciding that case are the people who receive the money that they have set and that they have requested. And there's a valid reason to do that. And whether this is the type... By the way, I could have done the amendment, I think, by just saying...writing some more intent language in there or something effective next year, whatever, it could have been done and then E & R would have come back down with a 57-page amendment that we would have voice voted over on Senator Maurstad's motion. But I went ahead and got the bill drafted up or the amendment drafted up the way it, I guess, should have been done. But I mean there's other ways to do that. And what I'm voting on is a policy. If we're not comfortable with a 57-page amendment that does I think just what I've mentioned, then I'd be happy to do it the other way so that we're more comfortable voting on E & R amendments, by voice vote that nobody has read. The issue is still there. The issue is, should DSS be making that decision? And I think there's...I think Senator Beutler mentioned, and he's absolutely accurate when he says there's a lot of things we should be looking at. I think that's absolutely right, I think that's absolutely right. We should be looking at the fact that our cost-efficiency has gone down progressively since 1989. The amount of money we're spending on child support collections has been going up but not at the rate one would expect it with the amount of collections that are being made. The cost-efficiency simply is not increased. And we're jumping into another major step, another major step where I'm hoping, I'm sure at some point when Senator Day opens on her bill she'll explain to us exactly how much cost-efficiency we're going to get out of this step. But we are making some major decisions here, and I think this is exactly the place we ought to be making a decision like this because we're talking about this issue. We're making major steps with the bill as introduced has several extremely big steps to take the court completely out of the process. The issue of putting the court back into it could not be more germane, could not be more relevant and simply could not be something, I think, foreign to this bill. That's the issue we're trying to decide. We're trying to decide should the court be involved or not involved. As originally introduced, the bill said we should have administrative garnishments, administrative attachment of property, those are major steps. That's exactly what we've been talking about. I think it's a legitimate policy decision to be made, and it likely doesn't have the votes to be