

September 29, 1992 LB 20

therefore, there is a need for money and these women are disadvantaged and they do need state assistance, but I don't think Nebraska should be leading the nation in its policies on this issue as we have the past several years. But neither do I believe Nebraska should trail the nation, and as Senator Ashford said, 30 other states have this policy. It is a reasonable policy. It says in the last three months of your pregnancy, the state will assist you and give you some cash assistance. No other cash assistance is available to a woman. I believe it would be good public policy. We are going to save a million, six or a million, seven. It is not as much as what the Governor recommended but we keep the policy. We say there is a need. We meet that need and we are within a range of what's reasonable and what's responsible and what's good public policy. And I think it would make good sense for this body to pass this amendment, to pass this onto LB 20, and if the filibuster then continues, then I think we will probably end up going back to where we were. If the filibuster ends, then I think there is some hope that we have good public policy and we have done something good for the people of Nebraska, and I would encourage the body to consider that. Thank you.

SENATOR CONWAY: Thank you, Senator. Senator Chambers, your light is next.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, Senator Ashford asked me some questions and Senator Horgan made some comments which have placed the discussion on a different plane now, but there is no way that I am going to say before a vote exactly what I would do based on the outcome of that vote, but I did say that circumstances would have altered. These women at this point in the pregnancy definitely need the help. I think they need it before this, but I have said over, and over, and over that this amendment would mitigate the damage that would be done by LB 20 if left in its original form. Now, beating your head against the wall can be stimulating at first, but after a time, it is not a pleasant experience. It makes the wall no difference. In this instance, I am not the wall. But when we have a short session such as this one, and a very substantive, serious change is made, not one that alters the program but that cuts it out altogether, there has got to be serious discussion about what is being done. If somebody or somebodies are not willing to force us to look at that issue and see what we are doing and discuss it, there is no chance of bringing the body to a position of being willing to consider any