

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR PIRSCH: ...intended to give these mothers with children, we wanted to give them medical aid, we wanted to give them health care, we wanted to help them in other ways, but not in the cash. So the federal government now, I believe their policy, of course, as many are aware of, is to get stricter, to cut down, to try to put some control on the welfare system. They are going to do that by eliminating our federal funding, which adds to our burden of state funding, which adds to the burden of our working poor, those who are trying to pay their taxes, are trying to hold jobs, are trying to raise their children and are asked to...

SPEAKER WITHEM: Time. Senator Wesely, followed by Senator Crosby.

SENATOR WESELY: Mr. Speaker, I hope we can be brief on this amendment, it's a rehash of the family cap, which I do support. It's already in the welfare bill. I don't know why we would need to have it in this particular bill. It would save, though, \$25,000 this year because it would take effect sooner than the other one. I think, to save time, we should just again vote against the Pirsch amendment and allow the issue to be debated on the welfare bill, not this bill. So I oppose the Pirsch amendment.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Wesely. Senator Crosby.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members. All I'm going to say, too, is I oppose this amendment. It doesn't belong in this bill and it is in the other one, which we talked about yesterday, and I will not support it. I won't support any of these amendments that Senator Pirsch is bringing to this bill. Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Pirsch.

SENATOR PIRSCH: I disagree with Senator Wesely. Senator Wesely, in our welfare bill now, and maybe we can kind of discuss that, we have said that if a woman is on welfare and, say, files in January and she has two or three children, and if she has another child within...after that ten-month period, then she is not eligible for a cash payment for that child only.