

6 years to homeowners, the same ones on this floor who say that \$71 a month is too much to offer to a child. I bet Senator Jensen would take advantage of it if he sold a house at a loss, Senator Maurstad would, and anybody else would who has two pennies worth of sense. But you don't hear any outcry about this, do you. You don't hear a whimper anywhere, 28 billion 700 million dollars in a 6 year period, and where is all the wailing, whimpering and hollering about the need to balance the budget? They can't even talk about balancing the budget yet or cutting the deficit because they want to continue giving these preferential tax...

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...cuts. I thought that was coming, but I at least think I got it in.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Senator Chambers, you're recognized next. I understand you want to yield your time to Senator Lindsay. Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Mr. President, members. I was just visiting with Senator Bohlke, a question about...I think she's correct, that it's not in law at this time, but the House representatives has adopted this approach. And if the body, which in its current composition as esteemed as it is. I think, by the majority of those here, has taken that as a favorable approach, I would think that we ought to be taking a no more harsh approach than that body is. Again, what this does recognize, what this amendment does recognize is that as a policy we can say, I guess, two strikes and you're out, sort of. You can have two kids and then from then on tough luck. As Senator Schimek mentioned on the last amendment we dealt with, it doesn't always work that way. It's not always quite that simple, because the expenses go on and the pregnancy itself may not be intentional. So what we look at, we look at, what does that encourage? What is the policy that we're trying to make? And I believe the policy that we're making and one with which I vehemently disagree, is a policy that says if you get pregnant while your on welfare, unintentionally, the position the state is encouraging you to take is to terminate that pregnancy because it's not responsible of you to continue that, it's not...and that is a policy, of course, that I think has been adopted in New Jersey. And I think, as has been mentioned, the net impact in New Jersey has been an 11 percent decrease in