

May 29, 1981

LB 561

happens to those individuals who have no resources upon which to draw. Now we can say, well, the reason that they are in that problem is because of their own mistakes and their own past errors. I am not here today to explain or to apologize for anyone's errors. Errors are made by rich and by poor, by educated and by illiterate, by a farmer and business man, by professional persons and the unskilled. Those errors are a matter of record and they are a matter of fact, but there is one thing that I believe we must get down to on this kind of an issue, and that is whether or not in a state which has a budget beyond which I ever dreamed it would see when I first came here thirteen years ago, whether or not we have the ability to take care and to provide for those individuals who cannot take care of themselves. Now I know it's easy to say that we have done all that is necessary and we've done all that has been sufficient. But I want to suggest to you that perhaps we have not. We did have a two-part commitment, as I recall, a year ago. We lived up to the first part and we have not lived up to the second part of that commitment. Again, I can speak with some experience that if we do not suspend the rules and if we do not act favorably upon my motion, it is not going to be adversely political to any of us, in fact, the opposite will probably be true. The adverse impact will happen if we vote this way because we are not dealing with politically astute persons. We are dealing with politically inanimate objects virtually, persons who have no influence, persons who have no clout, persons who do not have the ability to influence this body, persons who really have no single spokesman except those of us who are elected to represent them on a one on one basis. I have been asked since I offered this motion why I would do this because I come from a district which does not have a high incidence of ADC families. I want to say this. I happen to come from an area which we have some very good welfare directors, and those welfare directors are very astute, and they are very selective, and they do an excellent job of weeding out the individuals who are not deserving, and I think that is where the bottom line should be drawn. The local welfare director has the ability, has the knowledge and in most instances of which I am aware has the desire to take care of those responsibilities which are vested with him, and when they do that, they exercise the judgment which we vest in them and I am willing to leave it there. But I also want to give them the wherewithal to take care of that responsibility where they see it is necessary and not to have to dip into the coffers of the county. We have placed the counties

6128