

next year after a study and saying here is how we are going to do it because they don't want it. There is nothing in there that would want them...that would make them want to do it. There are no dollars involved whatsoever. It would cost. They'd have to come back in looking for money for it. Now I have no faith that it is going to get done if we study it. I wouldn't support study language being put in there because I think it is a farce, and I think it is misleading the people who would be relying upon this to think that their government may be doing something about it because we wouldn't be. We have an opportunity to do that. We have an opportunity to step forward, and I might add that as drafted, implementation date was not until '97. The whole concept was to work the kinks out and have next session to come back and straighten those out. DSS' position was we don't want to do that. We just simply don't want to do that. We don't need to have this on the books and come back next year and work those kinks out because they are not interested in doing it. And that is what the issue is. This bill is about dollars. We'd like to say it is about women and children but it is not. Women and children are going to get money through ADC. The state is going to get what they recover. The state is going to get...you just heard that discussion. That is who recovers the money that we are going to be squeezing out those last few dollars, and I say it is squeezing out because I still question the cost efficiency of what we are doing. Will we be spending more dollars than it warrants to collect those last few dollars? I will be looking forward to that when we get to the debate on the bill, itself, looking forward to seeing how that will come down because I don't think that's the case. So I do support the bracket motion, and I...that's the reason for doing that. I think it is one that...I think the issues ought to be coupled. I disagree with Senator Beutler. I think that that's...the decoupling of those has resulted in enormous arrearages. Parents that don't care, parents that move out of the state, parents that go into hiding, parents who you have to force by intercepting their tax refund, or by throwing them in jail, or by doing all sorts of other things to get them to pay because they don't know their kids. At least they know their car. At least they know what they are paying for then, but if they don't know their kids, why would they have any interest in paying for them. To them, it is somebody else's kids because they don't get to see them. Let's step forward and let these parents continue to develop their bond with their children, and I suspect you are going to have a lot more voluntary payment of support, rather than involuntary