

back to some of the previous amendments. And lastly, I would simply remind you that for some of the more important purposes there really is already a voucher system in effect, even for these children that are born after coming onto welfare, that's what our food assistance, food stamps are, for example, and as has already been reiterated on this floor, food stamps are not cut off for these children, it's the cash payment that's cut off, and a voucher is not a good substitute for that. Thank you.

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

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Thank you, Mr. President. I stand to support many of the comments that Senator Lindsay just shared, although I can't support this amendment, I would rather go back and revisit the Dierks amendment. But you know I think we ought to start referring to this as the family cash cap, because I get a kick out of every now and then when a senator expresses that we need to get in touch with the real world and what people back home are going to think about what we're doing. And as I've talked to people in my district about this, sure, they'd like to...they agree with the idea, the concept that we shouldn't reward additional childbearing for those that are under public assistance. But when I continue to visit with them and I say, but what we're talking about here is only discontinuing the cash which amounts to about \$60,000 in state funds and maybe another \$75,000 in federal funds, boy, they aren't near as supportive of that concept as what they read about in the rhetoric as far as what all we're trying to accomplish with this particular cap. Now I wonder what type of message we are trying to send by this particular provision and hope that, while the time is very limited, we have an opportunity to go back. I think, you know, if we really want to talk about matching what we're seeing with what the law is going to be then we need to go to the step of saying we're not going to provide any additional benefits, period, for additional children, and not continue on with this hoax that because we reduce the cash benefit that we're really going to have some meaningful impact in this problem. And I think everybody agrees that there certainly is a problem. But I don't know that people out there really are paying all that close of attention to what we're doing right now anyway. I certainly don't think that the people that are going to be affected by this particular provision are paying much attention to us right now, it's not something that they're going to