

activities that have been outlined and specified in the bill. My discussion may have been confusing. I wanted to say everything, so now I'm going to try to say it more simply. With this language in the bill a child born before 10 months had elapsed, while the family is on assistance, would have the mother present for 6 months before she had to start participating in these programs. A child born 10 months later would have her presence only for 12 weeks. This amendment would strike the 12 weeks and although there would still be language in the bill that says, this child shall be sacrificed for expediency and no additional cash assistance will be available, we will not deprive that child of the mother's presence. If you have any questions I will try to answer them in a way that will clarify rather than confuse.

SPEAKER WITHEM: On the Chambers amendment, Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think that as I understand what Senator Chambers is trying to do here, we can be agreeable to most of what he is saying. What we were talking about, if you remember, is to allow 12 weeks at home for a mother of a child on welfare as part of the contract who then would have after that, 3 months at home, would have from 3 to 6 months of part-time participation in the self-sufficiency contract and would then go from 6 months on into full participation of the contract. And I think his point about the fact that a child born later will be denied the additional cash payment, but shouldn't be denied the presence of the mother, at least on the part-time basis between three and six months is not an unreasonable argument. So I am inclined to be supportive. The idea though, is that there would not be then an extension on the two-year limit. That would retain itself and the three to six months would be part time so that there would be a level playing field with the other children that are born. And I think from what I can see of his language, that is what is accomplished, but that's, at least in my view, not an unreasonable request by Senator Chambers at this point. So I know he is discussing it further with Senator Rasmussen and Senator Bohlke and he can clarify his intent when he gets a chance, but again, let me run through with the scenario of what we've got in the bill currently. A child is born, the contract is signed after that child is born or about the time and it includes the child, then you end up with 12 weeks at home, just as family medical leave and you take care of the child. After 12 weeks you have to at least go part time into a job or job