

benefits for the...for the mother during the time when she started her employment, so that she would not lose health care benefits and nourishment benefits, and even a 30-day stipend for ADC benefits so there would not be a significant loss in income to her family during that time when she got work. I liken this amendment somewhat to that, is that there is a reasonable...I'm convinced that there is a reasonable relationship between the last three months of pregnancy and the state's interest in ensuring that that expectant mother has the ability to do the things that she needs to do to have a...to have the pregnancy be successful. It also meshes, to some degree, with the 518 program, because my experience in working with the poverty seminars, and the other work that we've done in this area, indicates that many of these expectant mothers are, in fact, trying to find employment or about ready to get into the job force. And if we help them in this last three months, I think that's going to encourage these individuals, under the 518 program, to find work. So I'm really torn here because I'm convinced, definitely convinced that we're going to...that this is good public policy, and that's why I moved it in the committee. I'm probably going to vote for the amendment now so that it's on the table as we proceed along. And I would encourage Senator Chambers to look very carefully at this, because I think he...with this amendment I think he has achieved good public policy here. I think that public policy starts to erode and the grey areas start to emerge as we go back in time from that three months, back to the point of conception, nine months prior to the birth of the child. But I believe there is a strong public policy at the three months. I would ask, I guess Senator Wesely is gone. I would like to know again just so I understand what the savings would be to the state, and Senator Wesely, you did give me this sheet, and I just...I don't quite understand from reading it what the savings would be if we adopt the three month rule that Senator Chambers is proposing at this time.

SPEAKER BAACK PRESIDING

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Okay. Senator Ashford, instead of saving about 2.2 to 2.4 million a year, we would save something between 1.6 and 1.7 million a year. So, essentially, it will cost us 6 or 700 thousand dollars in General Fund monies more...