

Then by way of offering Senator Pirsch a compromise, I am changing the two months to six months. That way I get the hundred year extension and I give Senator Pirsch four additional months to the two that she would have had originally. I'm trying to be reasonable in the dying part of the morning and I tried to show that by asking for machine votes instead of roll call votes, and I did not try to get a reconsideration of any of them because I feel that the body has blood in its eye with reference to my amendments and would not be likely to reconsider. So I'm offering now an amendment which does not do very much. We strike 1997 in line 10 and insert 2097. We strike "two" in line 12 and insert "six". In reality if you adopt this compromise, instead of a woman being able to receive the assistance during the last three months of the pregnancy, she would be able to receive it during the last six months of the pregnancy. And instead of Senator Pirsch's name going into oblivion as of 1997 when under her amendment all of this would take place, she would have a semi-immortalization until 2097 as a result of my amendment. So in addition to trying to help poor women, I am giving a grudging acknowledgement to Senator Pirsch for her tenacity and want to enshrine my recognition of her tenacity in the statute for a least 100 years unless another Legislature comes along and decides to change that. If Senator Pirsch could convince me that women who under the definitions of the statute don't need assistance, I would not fight as I'm fighting. If Senator Witek could convince me that every woman deemed poor according to the definition and terms of the statutes could find help without any assistance from the government, she would at least catch my attention. But I cannot buy what they're saying. When they talk so much about the government giving to these poor people and how it creates dependency and creates poverty, I don't understand that. These programs put food on the table. Poverty takes if off. To say that these programs hurt hungry people by providing them with food whereas they would not have had it makes no sense to me. That's that nonsense that Senator Crosby mentioned and others have that comes out of these articles from these people from these stink tanks that are scattered around the country. They ought to call them septic tanks. They get these jobs, they get grants, they get handouts, they're supported by people because they don't want to work, then they spin this stuff out, they spew it out. That's what septic tanks do and then people pick it up in legislatures and read it like it's the gospel. It's self-contradictory, it's factually inaccurate and I say again, historically incorrect, but they read it. Don't even understand