

that's going to have or have not...decide to have a child or maybe not even decide to have a child but they're going to have one anyway. This bill will have nothing to do with that. And I think we all need to get away from the rhetoric and get to the real issue, and the real issue is just this, in my judgment. This morning what did we do on the SOS bill? We said that there are some dollars we probably don't think we should spend but if we don't spend these dollars, and it was around, if I remember right, \$700,000, if we don't spend the monies, the only thing we're going to do is harm or hurt 264 some people. We're not going to get at Sonny Foster. We're not going to be able to make a major point some people argued, but we will do damage to these people we need to have controlled. Now I voted against that particular bill but the Legislature said all you're doing is damaging other people, we're aware of it now, we need to be better informed and watch it closer. And that's fine. Now we have an issue where all I...when I cut through all the rhetoric that I can, I finally get to the one key issue. I don't believe that whatever we do...I believe that whatever we do today is not going to have one ounce of difference on whether a welfare mother has a child or not. I'm sorry, it won't. Higher taxes that we may have to pay may not have a decision whether or not parents have more children or not, the point being what will...what is the real question. The real question is, in my judgment, if you have a mother that has a child that is under welfare, yes, they get food stamps still; yes, they still get health, they still get other things.

SENATOR HALL: One minute.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: But do we want to be able to give them the \$71, or whatever it's going to be, for that child? And the answer is if you vote against the Dierks amendment, you're not talking about a lot of money but you are talking about what a child may not have. And we've all been on this floor arguing that the most important developmental time of a child is from birth to three. We know that's the most important time. I, personally, if it's \$71 that might help get day care for the child, that might help with the payment, might get a pair of shoes, might be able to buy a better meal, I don't care what the reason is for if you have a family that is in need, I do not mind giving an extra \$71 because we're not talking about money to that child, taking it away is not going to do...

SENATOR HALL: Time.