

births to women on welfare, over one-third of those attributable to abortion. I don't think that's a policy that this state ought to be encouraging. But more so I think it's just simply cruel to say to a child that has no control over whether it's going to be born or when, or the economic status of the child's parents that it's not entitled to support, it's not entitled to those basics because of that. I don't think that that's an appropriate policy for this state to be taking. This amendment recognizes that, as would the last amendment. And I was, frankly, very encouraged by that...by the vote on that last amendment because I think it's indicating that there are quite a number in this body who view it in that manner. I think that the family cap is an exceptionally harsh portion of this bill, and I think that this amendment can help to soften that just a bit. I would urge the adoption of the amendment.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Senator Lindsay. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Bernard-Stevens, I would like to oppose this amendment. I think the main question with this amendment is the practicality, I mean not only the policy but the practicality of doing what is being suggested, that is providing for a voucher. And I guess common sense indicates to me that it's not a very practical solution to this problem. If the policy...if you want the opposite policy the better thing to do is just to go back to the Dierks amendment or simply allow the cash payment. What you're doing with a voucher I suspect is creating another very unworkable bureaucracy that will require a lot of administration and simply won't be workable. If this sort of thing were workable would we not have instituted this for the payments to the children who were already there before they came on welfare? Instead of giving them cash payments wouldn't we be providing vouchers for them, because all of us want to separate the always innocent children from the often times not so innocent adults. And if we could do that for the children that were already being taken care of on the system, we'd be providing vouchers that could be used for their needs only instead of cash payments. So obviously that's not very practical or we'd be doing that. So as it's not practical for the children who are already there, I suggest to you that it is no more practical for children that might be born after the signing of the welfare contract. And so I would hope that you would reject this idea for that reason, if for no other. If one has changed his mind about the policy itself it's better to go