

63 percent which is too low in my view. We can't get child care providers to care for these low income children, these families. In some cases these child care providers will take a handful of these low income children out of maybe 20 or 50 or 100, whatever they'll take a few percent, you know a few of the kids out of the goodness of their heart because they're losing money in terms of what it costs them to provide the care but that only goes so far. And as we slip further behind we get into a situation where we're simply going to...what's so incredible is that this is...we're talking 1989, 1988, 1990 and I don't know, how many of you were even here then? Obviously less than half of you because half of you have been here two years or less. What you are destined to do is if we don't do something and recognize this problem, we'll simply have the same problem repeat itself which is one reason why term limits are a bad idea because some of us can tell you about what happened and why it happened and how we can avoid it happening again and that's exactly the point I'm trying to make. Now the other point I'm trying to make though is that Senator Wehrbein and Senator Maurstad are saying that 75 percentile, we don't want to be caught in a situation where we're absolutely locked in. So I'm going to suggest that we look at a range figure, that the absolute minimum reimbursement ought to be 60 percent. If you get below that you're going to have nothing but trouble and you're going to know it when you see it because we saw it before. I would think some range between 60 to 75 percent, and you need the maximum at 75 percent because if you go beyond that, the federal funding stops and maybe we can go on on our own obviously, but it becomes quite expensive because without the federal match and the assistance. So the 75 percentile you know is something that I can live with as a maximum but there's no minimum here and maybe that's what we need to look at, that there be some minimum. Sixty percent would be the absolute lowest, I would think more like 65 percent would be as low as I'd feel good about, but a 65 to 75 or 60 to 65 or...excuse me, a 65 to 75 range or a 60 to 75 range makes sense to me and absolutely we shouldn't get below it. That was the whole intent of the amendment that we not allow a situation...

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: One minute.

SENATOR WESELY: ...where we didn't do anything again for another two years and another two years beyond that and end up with a disaster that we had in the late eighties repeating itself in the late nineties. There's no reason that we should