

not providing for that additional child conceived after they've gone into the system and signed the contract. And I think the point is that we signed a contract, we've got an understanding, and this is the situation, you're free to do what you wish, I mean obviously, but there are consequences and these are clearly what will happen, you won't get the cash payment, otherwise your child will be cared for. I don't think that's unreasonable. I think it's a reasonable effort to try to send the message that you have to gain control of your life and your destiny and when you take steps forward in a positive way you get positive results, and if you should choose to have a child there's a cost involved and you'll have to bear some of that cost, but we all know that. I mean as we have children we know that and make that decision. It seems like a reasonable message to send and one that I would continue to support so I rise in opposition to the Dierks amendment.

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

SENATOR WITEK: Mr. President, members of the body, I guess this is as good a time as any to mention on this area of debate a concern of mine. And I did not vote for.... I've supported the family cap and will continue to support the family cap. But I was wondering if members of the body had realized that what we have done, what you have done with your support of other amendments is to allow that a woman who got pregnant after...ten months after she was on welfare would receive the cash payments during the last three months of her pregnancy and then they would end at that time. So during those three months, at the end of her pregnancy, she would receive cash payments, but she would not be eligible to receive any monies after that for that child. And I guess it's what I perceive as an inconsistency, you're willing to support the child during the last three months of the woman's pregnancy, but not any support for that child afterwards. And I have, like I say, I have supported the family cap, I believe it is a policy decision. But then I have also supported ending the cash payment to the woman during those last three months of pregnancy, and I just wondered if people had realized, when they made these votes, that that's what we have done is award or given the woman this cash during those last three months of her pregnancy and then essentially taken away any cash for that particular child after...if she has been enrolled in a program for more than ten months. And to me it seems like a very strange inconsistency. Thank you.