

we're not going to cut the roads budget, to use those roads some time. Because right now the way it looks they may never have that opportunity or they are at least going to be very handicapped in the opportunity that they are given if we go ahead and adopt these committee amendments. I urge you to oppose the committee amendments. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Beutler, please.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Call the question.

SPEAKER NICHOL: The question has been called. Do I see five hands? I do. The question is, shall debate cease? All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Voting to cease debate. Record, Mr. Clerk, please.

CLERK: 26 ayes, 0 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Debate has ceased. Senator Warner, would you like to close on the committee amendments, please?

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I'd urge the adoption of the committee amendment. Just repeat again, it in fact does reduce the eligibility payment from \$280 a month to \$210 a month, but they retain full coverage and the reason it is dropped the \$70 is that the fetus, as the law now stands, would qualify as a child, I suppose you could say, and under the provisions why that payment wouldn't, eligibility, come till after delivery. Now I appreciate the position that Senator Wesely and Senator Johnson are in. My presumption then is correct. Senator Wesely made the suggestions and he was intended to put it on 201 and I would assume they were taking the position that if 201 could be passed that it would enhance its passage by the amendment that is being proposed on LB 31. It's kind of an expanded program, but not necessarily the cost by reducing it. Well we did not take the position that...similar to what Senator Wesely, we said the two issues ought to be separate and they will be separate if you adopt this amendment and I would urge that you do so. There may be some of you who would want to take the position that you enhance the passage of 201 by passage of this bill and I'm not trying to mislead anybody, but you could take that position. Certainly I make it clear that the Appropriations Committee, the majority at least, our decision was relatively only for one thing and that is that