

they are not convinced that the policy keeps women from having babies. Some raised questions about whether the state can or should try to regulate sexual and reproductive decisions. Abortion opponents say they fear such caps will encourage welfare mothers to choose abortion. Now get this, Senator Bohlke. New Jersey welfare officials themselves are now backing away from their earlier claims, saying more time is needed to gauge any effects on childbearing. "We don't have the numbers to show a link between the benefits limit and a decreasing birthrate", said William J. Maguire, Director of Camden County's Family Development Program, which enforces the cap. We continue. Even those who support the policy are saying that it was never intended to lower the birthrate. See how they lie? Now that they have been caught with their hand in the cookie jar, they say the thing which was their arguing point was not their intent. They're now saying it was never intended to lower the birthrate. We continue. The law took effect in August, 1993, under former Governor Jim Florio. It was immediately pronounced a triumph by New Jersey officials. After just two months, the state publicized numbers suggesting that births to welfare mothers already had fallen 16 percent. Officials began congratulating themselves. Eventually, the 16 percent drop shrank to 10 percent as the state belatedly became aware of births that went unreported earlier. Apparently many mothers saw no reason to report the births since their welfare benefits were not being increased. Now, even the lower percentage is being questioned. We go down further. In the first year, New Jersey denied cash benefits for 6,267 children, Senator Bohlke, children. We go further. The numbers suggest the cap saved the state about \$2 million that year, but state officials said they had not calculated the exact savings because they were relatively modest...

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...and because saving money was not the goal of the program. Another lie they got caught in. They're telling Senator Bohlke it doesn't save money. I want her to tell me that the purpose of this bill is not to save money. I want her to tell me it's not to reduce the birthrate. "Now, as other states eagerly embrace the New Jersey experiment, most welfare officials in New Jersey say they have adopted a wait and see attitude about the effects." We got a little burned with some of the earlier numbers, this man speaking who heads the Human Services Commission. He now says he has mixed feelings