

behind that I think or the belief behind that for purposes of putting in there that there's going to be an adjustment after that study is done. Under Senator Wehrbein's amendment what we're going to say is we're going to cap that up to an amount not to exceed 75 percent of the market rate survey and we don't really know right now what the market rate is. We don't know what's being paid. We do have a dollar figure and I appreciate that. A lot of times the specifics get in the way of the issue, but the question clearly has to be, does this make good sense overall? Because if you are in fact, if there's an attempt to reduce the amount that we're going to pay these individuals for reimbursement for child care, is do we then drive these individuals out of the marketplace? Is there no longer a desire for them if we're going to cap it at a certain level. I mean at what point do we have, I guess, a negative rate of return, if you will, for purposes of the reimbursement being so low that the desire to get into the arena or the child care area for purposes of reimbursement for these individuals falls off. In other words I remember the testimony, and I believe it was at the Judiciary Committee, where folks testified that, it was on a different issue, but that there was no money to be made, no money to be made with regard to the reimbursement the way it presently was. If there is a survey that's done and possibly it's done now, I don't know, but if there is a survey done statewide there could be a great discrepancy in terms of the amount that is paid in one portion of the state, one geographic area of the state as opposed to another. If you then use a mean from that survey to determine the state average and you reduce that to the seventy-fifth percentile of that mean, the potential is out there for folks who already right now in the urban areas receive what they consider to be an unjust fee for purposes of reimbursement. The potential is there with this amendment to pay them even less. For that figure to actually drop...

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...and if that's the intent of the amendment, whether it is or not I oppose it because what we're doing is we're, I believe, we're putting more roadblocks in the way for individuals to go to work, because if we can't find child care operations out there that will accept reimbursement when we can't even say what it is, but they won't accept it when we're basically factoring in a formula that uses a statewide mean and then averages it out based on a percentile, I could see where it is going to tremendously impact the more urban areas in the