

with those arguments to a great degree. And I find it ironic that some of the people who are supporting this amendment, which I am going to do, I am going to support this amendment and I'll tell you why in a minute, but some of the same people who are supporting this amendment don't want any money for family planning. And if you're going to have people, encourage people not to get pregnant, then you need some family planning services built into this bill. But, having said that, having said all that, I am going to support the Diers amendment. I have supported it in committee and I will continue to support it because I believe that even all the family planning in the world, there are pregnancies that occur, and I am supportive of the idea that I don't think the public does want to injure children. I know they don't. And I think that when you have a family on an income that is low, by everybody's standards, by the standards compared with other states, and then you're not going to provide anything extra for another child, should it occur, then I think that's wrong. But I have a hard time defending that position to some degree because of the arguments made by Senator Beutler and Senator Day and Senator Bohlke. I believe that we should be encouraging responsibility and I believe we should be encouraging women to concentrate on getting themselves off this program and taking care of themselves and their children. I believe all those things but pregnancies still do occur. I don't think they will stop occurring. I don't think that not providing the money will necessarily encourage abortions, just like I don't think that women have babies so they can get more money out of the system. I think both of those arguments are a little questionable. But I just...I just can't vote to cut them off if there is a pregnancy. Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Senator Pirsch.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and members of the Legislature, it is interesting to see the opposing sides which are very mixed, both pro-life, pro-choice. I would like to start out with telling you a little bit of history that Senator Bohlke shared with me. Originally, ADC was intended for widows and orphans, now orphans being those who were, of course, left without a father but already born, and the widows who were married to that father. That's what ADC originally started out. And it's interesting, the New Jersey World-Herald report that they did save money and, indeed, Rudolph Myers, an anthropologist who is evaluating the cap for the state, said