

indicated before, a lot of this debate we've had before, you know. The time has gone by on this bill that if we wanted to, we could invoke cloture. I have said I don't want to do that. I want to get to the next issue, certainly the cashing out of food stamps because we haven't debated that. But we do have some people here on the floor who actually also have not debated this question, and so I do think that, as I think about that, we do need to review some of the things that in response to what has been said and how this may or may not be harmful to children. I will remind you that with the cap, with us saying we will not give additional money for additional children, they continue to get food stamps. They continue to get Medicaid and they continue to get energy assistance. That means they sit down to a table with food, when they're sick they go to the doctor and they have a warm home. I think those are the essentials when we're talking about taking care of children. And I heard also Senator Lindsay talking about the families in his neighborhood that had ten kids on the block. That really gets at the essence of what we're speaking about. It is not, I didn't say irresponsibility, as he said, I said the issue is family planning. Now families may choose not to use family planning and that could very well be the case with those families with ten children. But I would also remind Senator Lindsay I, too, grew up in that very neighborhood and those families that had ten children were not asking the state for additional payments for each child they had. They were willing to make that sacrifice. They made it but they weren't asking the state for an additional reward of money for each additional child. Yes, we will recognize that when you have additional children we are all concerned that they have food, that they have a warm home and that they have medical care. We are saying that it is not our place, as a state, to give an additional monetary award for every additional child. It has not been that way. It was not originally intended to do that. As I told Senator Pirsch and she brought it up on the floor, originally ADC was for widows and orphans. That was the philosophy of when it began in 1935. That has evolved to what it is today but what we're saying is we need to recognize to keep children safe but to not reward those who choose to have additional children in a time of financial crisis. That is very different from other people who make that decision. Thank you. I oppose the Dierks amendment.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Senator Bohlke. Senator Beutler is next, but before I recognize him for speaking, there are guests