

September 28, 1992 LB 20

SENATOR SCHMIT: ...no, we're not going to give the \$73 a month, but yes, we will once the baby is born, once the baby is born we will immediately put the baby in intensive care. We will spend tens of thousands of dollars per day to extend that baby's life, even though it may be at that time mentally damaged, physically damaged to the point that it cannot possibly enjoy a full life. Is it not a much better investment to assist that mother to try to get her out of the cycle of poverty in which she is, to help her bring her baby to term, to give birth to a live, healthy baby, so as to break that scheme of things which we have so often committed ourselves to. I support the amendment, I wish it was for the full period of time, but I will support the amendment as of now in this context.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Schmit. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, Senator Crosby had touched on the relatively brief amount of time that women spend on ADC. Some of the things that drive them from ADC are the paperwork, which is unnecessarily, I think, troublesome and harassing in nature, the aggravation of meddlesome, rude, abusive caseworkers, and the invasion of privacy with questions asked that no civilized person ought to ask to another or of another. These are the kinds of things that go along with having to accept assistance in a governmental setting where people say the purpose of the government is to help those who need it. We should not make it such a shameful, difficult situation for people to receive help who need it. When I spoke to the committee in opposition to this bill, I talked about all of the different types of subsidies that the agricultural community receives. The subsidies are welfare, they are direct subsidy payments from the government, not where the government just ran off a lot of money at the print shop and started handing it out, but money paid in to the treasury in the form of taxes by me, by you, by others. Yet nobody talks about cutting those subsidies. And if anybody suggests it, he or she is excoriated and considered to be the worst kind of person filling shoe leather. Yet as with so many programs, and that is not the case with these, and I hope Senator Nelson is listening, the biggest farmers, biggest ones who make the most money have the largest spreads, are the ones who get the lions share of the farm subsidies. And some of them have mastered the system so well that they break their holdings up and place them under different members of the family, so that, instead of this one spread getting one subsidy, each one is considered an