

being given help which they need. Currently, the time period is a year. This law reduces it to six months unless the child is unfortunate enough to have been born a few days after nine months from the time the woman started receiving aid. If we think, and the policy will still be the same for all the other women. If their child happens to be born one day before that cutoff, they get the six months and if it is of value that a woman be with a child, and that's what I'm looking at, the child born the day after that day should not be deprived of the benefits of being with his or her mother. Now if we can give them all jobs that have benefits including maternity leave, we can abolish welfare, period, we don't even need it. But the reality is that we know those jobs are not there. Even Herman Kane (phonetic), head of Godfather's, who was criticizing Clinton's health care proposal pointed out that two-thirds of his workers are part-time and short-time and have no benefits whatsoever and most of them are youngsters, too. So you're saying after 12 weeks send this mother out here looking in a job market where we know the jobs are not of the kind that will qualify under our definition as an available job, put her through it just to have her go through it because other women who have jobs go to work. The mistake is trying to equate the situation on welfare with the situation of people who have jobs. It's exactly why when these task forces are put together and they put secure people on them, people with jobs on them, people who if you took their job from them and did not give them some kind of way to make it without them working, they would die before the month is over because they're used to somebody taking care of them. The people on those task forces have soft, easy jobs with benefits that a lot of people will never get even though they work a lot harder on the jobs they have. So when you take comfortable people and tell them we want you to lay out a plan to deal with those who are uncomfortable, when you don't even know the meaning of hunger, we want you to put together a plan for those who are hungry. It will be just like the "Repelicans" when Bush...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...and Reagan were there. They said, if these people were more righteous, they wouldn't be poor. That was their philosophy and it seems to be the philosophy that is going to take over this Legislature. From certain people, I would not be surprised, but from others, not only am I surprised, I am disappointed, unless all those things we've