

pregnant mother, because we have already got in the budget \$162,000 to meet that need. So because of that budget item and because of the offsetting cuts and then additions that we make in that bill, we break out about even, and really don't need to worry about an appropriation for this year. The problem comes when we start talking about next year. And if you will look at that memo, and you should all have one on your desk, if you don't, I have some extra copies, you will see that next year the cost to the State of Nebraska will be \$664,000. \$278,000 will be what we would normally have paid anyway if the federal government had not backed out. \$386,000 would be what would be picked up because of this amendment. That would be additional money. But because the feds have pulled out, I guess the original \$278,000 would be extra cost as well. So that \$664,000 that we are going to pick up, the feds and we had shared in the past, we will save about \$420,000 so that next year the net impact will be about \$243,000 to the state that we will have to pay in additional appropriation. That is using all these different figures. Now if we would adopt the Pirsch amendment, that would be next year a cut of about \$664,000. Now the question you have got to ask yourself is whether that cut and that savings is worth the price of not helping poor mothers who are having a child who are now pregnant and cannot care for that child to meet the need qualifications.

PRESIDENT: One minute, Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. President. Or whether it is more important that we cut that amount of money. My personal feeling is that it is so important that we care for the unborn because of the nutritional needs that they have, because of the impacts of not caring for that child, that result in retardation and developmental disabilities when it is born, is that the price we pay to care for that child during pregnancy will be much offset by the savings we make in the long run by not having the possible complications that would result from lack of nutritional care. So it seems to me that we really do win in the long run by opposing the Pirsch amendment and extending the state support for this program. And I think the figures that you have can help you to make your own individual judgment. My judgment is to oppose the Pirsch amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator Schmit...no, Senator Kahle, excuse me. Senator Kahle, you are next.

SENATOR KAHLE: Mr. President and members, I am going to