

adjusted the standard of need, we are 43 percent below where we once were in terms of that standard of need when it was...when I first came in, in 1997, so we don't make that up. Forever more, even with this amendment, to have the Consumer Price Index go up automatically, we'll always be 40 percent below where this Legislature, this state once was. So this is not a generous attempt here. This is a modest effort to keep us from falling even further behind where the state once was. Furthermore, we are also 65 percent below what the poverty level is. So our ADC standard was always below poverty but now we're even further behind. We're cutting off from ADC two-thirds of those that would be considered poor, that is they are under the poverty level, but 65 percent of those are not poor enough, and that won't change because the poverty level is adjusted, by and large, on the Consumer Price Index. So all I'm suggesting is that we've fallen far behind where the poverty level is, far behind where the state once was, let's not fall any further behind and just try and make that adjustment. And then this Legislature can determine the payment level and how much assistance we provide but the qualifying question is really a matter of poverty and that we track and keep track of in a systematic fashion and systematically ought to respond to it. Now another thing I'm going to pass out for you, I think someone told me Senator Maurstad said one of the things we're trying to do is cut the cost through this welfare program. Well, clearly it does that. There are millions of dollars of savings in ADC that occur because of the cutoff. So that's going to happen. But the other thing I want to make the point about is that we have not been seeing an extravagant explosion of expenses on ADC. I will pass out a chart for you that will show that in 1985 we spent about 23 million and a half, \$23.5 million in 1985. We'll spend less than 22 million this year, 1995 budget. So in ten year's time we're actually a little bit below what we spent ten years ago, again, not accounting for inflation or anything else and the amount of families covered is even up a bit. It's a little unclear on that point. But the point I'm making is that we're fighting over welfare, the cost of welfare, how expensive welfare is. We've got to stop that. Well, in fact, it has been very level, very level in terms of how much expenditures are there. The range has basically been between 20,000 and 25...excuse me, 20 million and 25 million dollars a year. It goes up and down a million or two a year, that's it. It's been very stable. So we have not been extravagant on the program. We have not been spending huge amounts of money that has gone up out of sight. What we're dealing with here is more