

out-of-wedlock births or people living together without the benefit of marriage and that kind of thing. It was a slow thing that developed in the seventies. I think there is a pendulum going back the other way now as we see some of these things and some of these ideas weren't great ideas. But the historical note I'll add to what Senator Wesely said is that Aid to Dependent Children started in the thirties with President Roosevelt, and the idea at that time was so the mothers could stay home with the children. The fathers were out, a lot of them going across country trying to find work. I remember really well. My dad went out every day looking for a job because he didn't have one. But that was the point of ADC, so the mother could stay home, so this didn't start, ADC did not start in the sixties. That's my own... I want to make that point so you realize it started in the thirties and it may not have been exactly the same program, but the idea was so the mother could stay home with the baby. The other thing I want to talk about is this column from the World-Herald where Gerry Oligmueller is quoted as saying that a mother could come up with \$23,000 in benefits and so on. Well, in the first place Gerry Oligmueller is a professional bureaucrat who is trying to survive at DSS I'm sure and he, of course, is going to work at finding a hypothetical case to back up their ideas about welfare reform. But the other thing to remember is not every woman gets every one of those benefits. They do not. When they look at the need statement and see what she needs, they don't get everything. That 23,000 is a distortion and it's not cash, it's not money she's putting in the bank and saving up. It's benefits that a woman or a family gets when they are on ADC. So I just wanted to point out those two things. I think this debate has deteriorated and I would hope that Senator Pirsch would give up pretty soon and let us have the three months. The three months isn't going to cost us that much and when she says it's not the money, it's the philosophy, folks, when people say that, remember, when they say it's not the money, it's the principle of the thing, remember, it's the money and that's what we're talking about. What this bill should be is sitting up there waiting for the budget and to see what happens on the budget itself. She talks a lot about that, but doesn't want it to be in line really, and if we just had the three months, I think we would come out very well. And then the July 1, '95 money that is in there now for the whole nine months would come out. The other thing I'd like to say is this is something that we have made an agreement under LB 455, it will be a contract with the mother and I know 455 is going to pass. That will be a