

September 29, 1992 LB 20

hearing established this, which would tell us with any precision what actually is done with this money. So it creates a set of circumstances, as she pointed out, where these women can be accused of all types of misuse of the money and abuse of the program. But those accusations are not based on any study or concrete evidence. It is...those accusations are based on this feeling that people have that those who are poor and need assistance probably are dishonest. And since they probably are dishonest, they're going to get money that they're likely not to be entitled to. And since they are dishonest and got this money that they're really not entitled to...

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...then the conclusion is that they're going to use it for a purpose that is not proper. And if you accept that kind of reasoning, you've created a justification within your mind for being against these programs. The only problem is that the reasoning is fallacious and it's flawed. And because we are unwilling or because that information has not been gotten to us, it is easier to adopt any rationalization that brings us to a conclusion that we want to reach. And at this point the conclusion that many want to reach is that this program should be annihilated. It should be erased, and I don't think so. And every time I see Senator Moore come in or move and he calls my attention to himself, I have to mention again his statement that when you take this money away there are still other things that will help this person. Well, take away the per diem, Senator Moore, that we get...

SPEAKER BAACK: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...and we still get a salary.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Schimek, you're next.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Mr. President and members of the body, I rise with reluctance because I said I wasn't going to speak again today and here I am again today. I hope you will indulge me for a few minutes. Senator Crosby, I don't think I'm going to support your amendment even though I support the concept and mainly because I just don't think that if there's not support for three months there won't be support for six months payments. However, if we don't adopt some kind of an amendment, yours or