

be cut by \$5 a month, I'm not sure that is really a fair step to take at this time. First off, I think it ought to be deliberated on the floor and should be a legislative action, not a unilateral executive action as is being contemplated at this time. And I think secondly, it puts the poor fighting the poor essentially, that the ADC pregnant mother is going to lose her benefits unless the ADC mother with the child already born gets a \$5 cut in their monthly payments. We are having a tradeoff here between poor and poor and I'm not sure that is really a fair circumstance to put people in. Perhaps at this time if this program and this funding is important enough we should just decide that it has got a priority in the state and fund it and then talk about reductions in ADC benefits next summer when we have a little more time or next spring, I should say.

SPEAKER MARVEL: You have one minute.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Have time to really consider that action because I think at this time that that really would not be an appropriate executive action. It would be much more appropriate if the Legislature would set that priority rather than the Governor himself. So what I am saying is that the committee amendments are good. They are valuable. They should be adopted. They will bring a cost to this state but you have to decide individually if that is a priority that the state ought to pick up and then we should talk about the funding questions in light of the other cuts and I think you should trade this off with other cuts we are making and trade this off also with other budget cuts coming down the road from the federal government. It is not an isolated issue is what I am saying. It is part of a bigger issue that we are all going to be facing in the coming months.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Fenger.

SENATOR FENGER: Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of the committee amendments as proposed. The fiscal impact of this committee amendment is approximately \$225,000 and I realize at first glance that is not in line with the reason for this special session called to consider a \$25 million shortfall. The practical realities, however, in my opinion, are they won't cost us anything. The federal regulation that creates the need for LB 7 says that it must take effect within thirty days after we adjourn. That is the reason you find the E clause in Section 5. Now if this bill were enacted but without 33 votes, we would sustain a penalty for two months that would create