

this bill because we know people are going to be cut off after two years. We know that, even under certain circumstances where a family may be allowed to have medical care for a certain period of time, a point will be reached where all of that is terminated, period. Not everybody is going to be able to obtain a job paying a living wage so we will have people who are destitute, some to the point of being homeless and without food, many without medical care, which will be reflective of what happens to many people who are not on aid at this point. And with reference to the rest of what Senator Crosby has put in her amendment, I don't see anything which is untrue. Senator Maurstad made a very good point, although I disagree with his conclusion that we ought to use that as a basis to kill her amendment. I think that's a reason for adopting it. Senator Maurstad, your discussion encapsulated, without you saying it, the philosophy of the true knife fighter. When you make a move, you want to cut long, wide and deep. As you pointed out, there is listed here a number of agencies, subdivisions and others that will have to be looked at in terms of the impact of what this so-called welfare reform bill will have. What Senator Maurstad pointed out, but for other reasons, is the profound impact that this bill is going to have. And, because it might be difficult to evaluate that impact, it may even be painful to do so. His feeling is that we ought not require that it be done. I'm not going to be able to give all of my thoughts on this point because I have a few miscellaneous comments I want to make. Some have said that, in the form of a bill, Senator Crosby's proposed amendment was voted down seven to nothing. That reminds me of a joke. There was this poor "wider", "wider" woman in the county, but she was really disliked and those who didn't dislike her feared the banker who wanted to foreclose and take the poor "wider's" homestead and everything she had. So the banker took her to court and the jury, composed in equal numbers of those who hated the "wider" and those who feared the banker, voted unanimously for the banker. The judge was very angry when he saw this opinion come back from the jury and he said, I want you people to know that in this county it takes at least 13 people, including me, to deprive a poor "wider" of her homestead and everything that she has. Your verdict is set aside. So the fact that you can get a number of people like those on the welfare committee, they call it Health and Human Services now, and, by the way, that name was changed as well as the welfare...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.