

now. We are currently paying in the neighborhood of \$27,000,00 to all of welfare programs. This particular bill would add a minimum of \$15,000,000 unless we, the Welfare Department switches over to the other formula. If and when they do that, then the Federal Government will start participating in some of that \$15,000,00, unless the Welfare Department picks up the standard of needs and increases it which we could go full \$15,000,000 any way you look at it. Now, my objection to this bill and to the one coming is not that I'm laying in the bushes trying to ambush any children. I would be the last one in the world to deny a child a comfortable, warm house to live in, food in its stomach and enough clothes to get it to school and back, get it to the point where it can subsist, but I don't believe we should get welfare to the point where they can make more by going on welfare than they can by working. We have no incentive at that point for them to get off of welfare in the future. The, there is always the old adage; well, if you're going to say no to this, then what are you going to do. In other words, are you just going to go negative all the way or are you going to go, going to show us how to solve the problem? My philosophy, frankly, is that if we don't give the kids of the future, of this State the tool with which they can make it on their own, we're going to continue to build the welfare rolls. Now I know that the additional caseload on welfare has leveled off. In fact, it's our understanding that it has decreased somewhere between 1,000 and 2,000 cases in the last couple of years but if we convert from a statutory limit of, in the amount of welfare that we pay to 100% of whatever the Welfare Department decides we should pay and that is what this bill is asking you to do, this bill says, give them 100% of whatever the Welfare Department says they should have, you're looking for trouble. Now, my, getting back to the point of how to positively do it. I say, let's give these kids the education with which they can make it on their own. That is the only way we'll break the cycle and eliminate the generation after generation cycle of welfare recipient families. If we don't give them the educational--and education is the only tool I know of to give them by which they can make it on their own, if we give them that tool, that's where we should be concentrating and let them be in a position to make it on their own and not have to depend on welfare. With that I close.

SPEAKER: Senator Stahmer.

SENATOR STAHMER: Mr. President and Members of the body. I would just like to stand up and oppose the kill motion on this bill. I'd like to point out that I introduced a similar bill two years ago and I was approached by a group to introduce a bill similar to Senator Chambers' and I said I think Senator Chambers has a better chance of getting this bill passed than I do and I think he demonstrated that by bringing it up here on the floor and I think that one of the things we have to answer to is answer to these children. Now you just had a resolution bounced off the desk of the Speaker this morning that says we're going to petition Congress so there won't be any abortions. Fine, I can support that provided we provide for needy children. I want to find who's going to support the children and then correlate it with who does or doesn't support abortion. I guarantee you I'll support the abortion measure to Congress if we give some sta--if we give some money to help these children, but I think many of the people who don't want to help the children are going to go around and say then, we're going to outlaw abortions. I, I think, that's very inconsistent to say the least.

SPEAKER: Senator Fowler.