

should be rejected.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President, members of the Legislature, even by inadvertence, every time somebody stands up they talk like these women are idiots while trying to pretend that they respect them. Senator Matzke said food stamps are like monopoly or play money and these women don't realize they have a monetary value. Yes, they do. They know that these food stamps take the place of money and they know they have a monetary value. This is not monopoly we're dealing with. And because that is the level of understanding or lack of understanding that we deal with explains why it's so difficult to get anything realistic done. First of all, some information was passed to me and I'm sure others of you have seen it, we should keep in mind that the food stamp program is a nutrition program, that the purpose is to try to fight hunger. And something that people seldom mention is that it also is a subsidy program for agriculture, that's why it's administered by the Department of Agriculture, it's an agricultural subsidy program. It's a way to help bolster and buttress agriculture. To take this money, which is inadequate anyway, and put it in the context of the Draconian aspects of this bill, I used that word because Senator Beutler said it's not Draconian, but it is, you have a woman who has a child for which she can receive no assistance. You put cash in her hands. Unlike the rest of you, I think that woman cares about her baby. And I think she would want to buy diapers for that baby and the other nonfood items that are necessary to take care of that child. So that means less money for food, no matter how well she manages it, you can only get so much out of a turnip, and you cannot turn a turnip into steak. But at any rate when that money is spent, there is nothing for food, and it's not because she's a spendthrift and she's squandering it. Somebody said, I think Senator Matzke, maybe it wasn't him, she might get that first big cash amount, I don't know who used that term, and squander it. First of all it's not a big cash amount. Senator Matzke didn't say that, it's not a big cash amount. We're not talking about large amounts of money here. She's not going to squander it, the money is not enough to go anywhere. So if we're talking about trying to ensure that there is food available with all of the defects, based on what this bill, 455, is doing in terms of cutting a woman off, food stamps would be best left in place so that there is some opportunity to ensure nutrition. Some of you all have not been poor, really, you talk