

wanted to mention that for the record. I'm not going to argue with farm policy, even though I would argue them, though now is not the time to do it. But another thing just simply for the record. Senator Chambers' amendment is similar to LB 27 introduced by Senator Wesely. If you care to look in your bill books at the fiscal impact of the amendment, basically what it would do, in the first year, if you adopt this amendment there would be a savings of about a half million dollars for the state. Next year there would actually be...increase the actual cost of the present...it would be a cost over an amount...the present costs of this program of about \$40,000, because you'd have the prenatal care would be taken out for a full year. And so...but if your purpose is to save money it's certainly defeated with this amendment. Certainly, you know, two good arguments, a valid discussion to have, it's probably unfortunate we're going to have it with 30 members present, but I think it's probably a legitimate question on both of them, and they should just have it on the last trimester, which I believe half the states do. A good argument can be made at the very least we ought to do that, even though I'll sit here and vote against the whole thing. But certainly the prob...obviously the biggest problem with...from the point of determination, the person is determined to pregnant and forward, up until that last trimester the state pays the total cost of that. Obviously, in the last trimester there's a federal match rate from the hosanna above that Senator Chambers talked about. And the prenatal care, that's something that I would seriously consider looking at, I'm going to say not this session, but at a later time. I think a good argument can be made that money spent there is money well spent. I'm going to vote against the entire Chambers amendment. But certainly the second half of that being the...raising the eligibility standard so more people can qualify for prenatal care, that is certainly a discussion we ought to have. It's one of those things it's easy to say when there's some more money there, but obviously we in a budget cutting session now. But at a time when money is available, that's certainly something that I would consider very seriously, I think it's something that makes sense. And so with that, certainly we understand what the fiscal impact of the amendment is, you would...instead of saving one point...instead of saving \$1 million this year, you'd only save a half million dollars in our present fiscal year. Next year, instead of over a \$2 million impact, you'd actually have a \$40,000 increase in appropriations. That's the fiscal impact of Senator Chambers' amendment.