

increases thereupon," so that the new wording would read, "the payment standard shall be based upon family size and shall ensure incremental benefit increases thereupon." And then it goes on to say, "except that child support or other income received on behalf of child or children shall not be considered as countable income to the recipient family in determining the amount of their cash assistance payment." That is the sum and substance of the amendment and I urge your support. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator. Senator Wesely, your light is next.

SENATOR WESELY: Madam President, members, I oppose the Dierks amendment. We just adopted part of his amendment with the amendment we just adopted by Senator Chambers so that the time at home would be the same for a child born after the first 10 months of the self-sufficiency contract so that that child will have the same time at home as the other children in the family. So we've dealt with that aspect of Senator Dierks' concern and we've also dealt with I guess part of his amendment takes away the child support if you don't have the public...under his amendment he still wouldn't count the child...oh, my gosh, so Senator Dierks is now not only not counting child support and adding that but adding the \$71 that was originally supposed to be provided so I would say no way. I mean part of the trade-off was we agreed to allow for if you have additional children, the general public, the taxpayer so to speak, would not pay the additional \$71, but we would provide the health care and the child care and the food stamps and we would allow for and go this extra step to the committee amendments for additional child support from the father of that child and allow that to not be counted against the income of the family. Now, Senator Dierks, as I understand the drafting wants to keep that additional child support and add to it \$71. There's almost an incentive to have more children, Senator Dierks. You're adding, not subtracting from incentives here to add children to that family and I think that's wrong. I think we have talked about and voted on this issue before. We've bent over backwards, we've made adjustments. We also added in the amendment we just adopted that before they go statewide with this concept of a family cap, that the Department of Social Services review its impact in the first phase of implementation so we are concerned about what will happen. We're not ignoring the concerns that are being expressed here. We're going cautiously in this area, but we have thought about this