

a loss equal to or perhaps even exceeding the additional cost created by the amendment and I support this committee amendment because I don't believe that there would be 33 affirmative votes on the floor without it. I thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Rumery.

SENATOR RUMERY: Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to ask Senator Cullan a question if I might.

SENATOR CULLAN: Yes, Senator Rumery.

SENATOR RUMERY: Senator Cullan, will you explain again how we are going to raise this extra money? I didn't quite understand that when you were explaining it.

SENATOR CULLAN: Well we have not made any changes in the Governor's bill nor have we introduced an A bill on LB 7. In other words, we are simply going to recommend to the Governor that he make up the additional increase of three hundred and some thousand dollars required by this bill by cuts in the basic grant for Aid to Dependent Children programs. Now that would be my recommendation. If the Legislature wants us to handle it differently then I suppose an appropriations bill would have to be introduced or we would have to amend LB 8 but my own viewpoint would be that we just cut the basic ADC grant from \$210 a month to \$205 a month.

SENATOR RUMERY: Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Vard Johnson and then Senator Lowell Johnson. No, I'm sorry, then Senator Kahle and then Senator Lowell Johnson. Senator Johnson.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I support the amendment. I thought I would chart a little history of this amendment because I had a hand in it back in 1973 when I represented a pregnant mother who had no resources whatsoever and who applied for ADC benefits but they were then denied to her because at that time the state policy simply was we would not pay ADC benefits until the child was born. So in behalf of this pregnant mother I filed an action in the United States District Court in the District of Nebraska in Lincoln before Honorable Warren Urbom and the action was certified as a class action and Judge Urbom held that Nebraska's policies did not conform to his interpretation of federal policies and, therefore, benefits not only had to be provided to this pregnant mother but to every other pregnant mother who was poor. And so as a result of that litigation