

SENATOR PIRSCH: And you were saying it's germane to this particular part of the amendment then.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Since that is...since the...on page 2 of the Bohlke amendment, which is still the division that we're talking about, division one, it references section...on page...line 15 it references the Section 68-1721 in this division we're working on now.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Okay. I will accept your decision, Mr. Speaker. But I guess I would object to this kind of amendment on this particular section. I think it would be more appropriate to the entire bill itself as it stands. And, quite frankly, I do not support Senator Dierks' amendment, and I'm sorry for that, Senator Dierks, but I do not think that this is appropriate at this time, that it should be considered on the whole bill, and at that time I may consider it, but I think it is totally a different tack and should be considered with the entire bill as we consider these amendments.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Senator Pirsch. Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Legislature. I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think it's a reasonable effort on Senator Dierks part to try to address the concern, it's not the same thing we've looked at before. But I continue to feel that the concept of a family cap is not inappropriate. And though New Jersey may be experiencing some difficulty, I think at the same time the message it sends is the right one. What it...how this would operate is somebody, as I understand it, is somebody would come into the welfare office and say, I need ADC, we would negotiate with them and then sign a contract between the state and the individual on how we would proceed, what kind of services would be rendered, what kind of goals would be set, that sort of thing. At that point, as I understand it then, if the mother involved, whatever children are involved or if she's pregnant, she would get coverage in cash payment. But if she should become pregnant after that point, after the contract is signed, ten months or so later she would not get the cash payment, the \$71 a month. Now there would be the food stamps, I think, and the other types of assistance so that the child born will get the medical care and food and et cetera. But the additional cash is all that we're