

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Are you worried about whether or not this bill can go if we provide an adequate amount of reimbursement?

SENATOR BOHLKE: Well I would worry that this amendment would cost \$12.5 million.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And that's too high an amount to pay in order to really provide child care. In other words, it's all right with you all if we say that child care is available but if in the real world there is no child care, then a woman can be cut off because she doesn't go to work.

SENATOR BOHLKE: That's not what I'm saying. You just asked me my reaction. I said I would worry about the fact and I think it would pass. I said I think I would be worried if it would pass with a \$12.5 million price tag.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But you didn't say that would stop you from considering the need.

SENATOR BOHLKE: That's not...right, but you asked me if I thought it would pass.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Then I'll ask the question, are you willing to consider the need?

SENATOR BOHLKE: Senator Chambers, I have said I would be willing to consider the need of not letting it drop below a certain level which is a little different than what you're saying.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Time. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President and members, I rise in support of Senator Chambers' amendment. I had a similar amendment that's on the desk that just set the reimbursement rate at amount equal to the seventy-fifth percentile of the market rate survey as opposed to the not less than that Senator Chambers has in his amendment. What in effect his amendment does is the same exact thing because what will happen is it will be set at the seventy-fifth percentile and that will be the reimbursement rate. The issue of the concept behind where do we spend the dollars and what do we get for our return on that investment? I think that this is probably the, one of if not