

amendment feeling that it is a decent compromise. It is one that does not change the guidelines significant today, but does allow legislative review, that is the basic beneficial desire here is that we will have legislative review, the Legislature will be able to look at what the income levels ought to be. And I think that it's pretty hard for this Legislature to justify this kind of exemption without some sort of a legitimate and reasonable lid, and this \$26,000 figure is, in fact, very legitimate. It is not a significant change from what is being done today and yet it does target for low income folks. So with that, I would urge this body to accept this as a compromise. I think it is a legitimate compromise and one this Legislature ought to consider very seriously and adopt. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I rise in support of the Newell amendment. I think it's a much more reasonable one than the Goodrich amendment. I have been one who has talked frequently in the past about the problems of targeting too much of the money to the higher income families which need this assistance and I felt that the pressures put on by many of the Senators in this body were heard by the fund. You saw this last issue had a targeted figure of about a third of the monies to lower income individuals. That money...they weren't sure how it would go but, in fact, they used it up and they used it up quickly, that it was very much a success. And we tried an amendment last year, Senator Beutler and I and others tried to get an amendment which would have held money for the lower income individuals for a certain amount of time before it would reconvert back into the fund and then used for anybody who needed it, and we failed on that amendment but essentially the same policy was adopted by the Fund Board and it was tried this last year, and as I said, it was a success. So I think the efforts by this body in raising the issues, and Senator Goodrich's amendment I think was very clear in saying to that Fund that we don't want that money going to the people that don't need it. We want it to go to the low and moderate income people that it was intended to help. So I think in that sense the pressure that we keep putting on that body is being heard and that they are responding. It's probably a better thing to do it that way that they are more flexible and probably in the end if they do follow our wishes are better at doing that on the administrative side than we would be legislating it over here. Nevertheless, the Newell amendment does make