

poverty line, where we have worked within our other system very hard to establish a sliding fee schedule, which would address the needs of those near-poor and poor who are in danger possibly of going on welfare. And that sliding fee scale goes to 110 percent of poverty, so already we have a two-track system that is very different. But the way that the Department of Social Services has been considering managing the costs of child care has been to lower the income guidelines for those people, especially those who are in the nontransitional services, where it goes to 110 percent of poverty, and lowering that possibly to below the poverty level. I am supporting this amendment, it does not totally solve the problem and...but we still are maintaining the Legislature's involvement in controlling the costs, and it also balances out the very real need to pay more equitably for child care with making sure that we continue to provide care to as many poor families as we reasonably can afford to. Many other states have managed their costs by cutting off services to families, not based on income or need, but based on when they apply, so that they have huge waiting lists of people who very well may be in great need who cannot get any kinds of services. And I would prefer to have a balanced approach and that's why I'm supporting the Wesley amendment.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Senator Brown. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I'd like to reemphasize what Senator Beutler had mentioned and what I had talked about earlier. This bill is ballyhooed as being the greatest thing that this state has come up with. It's going to be the salvation of the state and it's going to take all poor women out of poverty, it's going to get everybody off welfare, it's going to stop teenage pregnancy, it's going to make people pay their child support, and in short it's going to be a straight passage from the Governor's seat into the U.S. Senate for Ben Nelson, but it's not going to work that way. And those of you all who are being realistic about this know it just like I know it. Some people, in order to prevent the state from showing any kindness to those who are unfortunate, will raise the red herring of social engineering, as they call it. But they use that term only when they want to prevent the state from doing something to help those who cannot help themselves. But when we turn to the other side and try to see how many hurtful things can be done, that to me is really social engineering