

would bring us to in terms of savings. If you want to see where we're at with the original bill, it's the next line down, that's the elimination of the entire program. If you total those up, over the three years we're talking about, if you stayed with the bill as it is you'd save approximately 5.8 million. If you go with the amendment that Senator Chambers is offering, it's about 4.1 million savings. Roughly you save, instead of the full loaf, you save about two-thirds. Okay? You're two-thirds of the way towards the savings, you don't go all the way to the savings. Again, but that one-third you don't save, you turn around and you bring in the federal funds, because of the match, and I think in terms of policy I am comfortable with that and feel good about that. I was asked about those people now on the program receiving benefits. I guess the status, first off, this would not take effect until December 1, that's two months from now. So the question would be, at that point are they in the final trimester of the pregnancy? Their assistance would continue if they are. If they're earlier than that, their assistance would stop until they do enter their third trimester. So that's how it would effect the current recipients. And currently, let me see here now, there are 1,269 individuals, totally, under the program, and there are 570 under the state only, that's the program that we would eliminate still, including the Chambers amendment, we'd still drop 570 people off a month, that's 330 would be reduced in the \$71 grant, and 240 would lose the 293. So you're now affecting, instead of 1,269 cases a month, you're affecting 570 cases. So I want to...I hope that clarifies it better on the fiscal impact. I want to get back to Senator Rasmussen talked about the system change. We know that we need a change, the welfare system, the ADC system is in need of a review and a look, and I'm certainly interested in doing that, and have been looking at it. We will try and find some ideas to reflect that over the course of the next few months and into the next few years. I do want to also agree with Senator Horgan that I think the message out to those individuals that want to have the program reinstated in 1995, is that some of us don't know that that's a good idea. The idea of having the last trimester covered is justifiable in my mind, but going back to the point at which pregnancy is verified is, in my view, not the best public policy. That I would prefer, as has been indicated, prenatal care administered, a broader range of individuals at that point. And so I guess I don't think anyone should interpret this to mean absolutely, positively in 1995 you get back to where we were. But it does mean we readdress the issue, and maybe I'll be changed in my mind, maybe we'll go to