

identify them when they have no support of mothers or fathers. They're not up to wake them up, they're late, they're dressed, not well, they've not had breakfast, and indeed if they even come at all, because children get embarrassed about not having a good start in the morning and being late, so they might be liable to not come at all. We have breakfast programs in schools now. We have taken care of that nutrition for the child, but we can't be in every home to make sure that that child gets up, gets dressed and gets off to school every day, whether they want to or not. So this is the stick with the carrot. I have a lot of admiration for Bob Armstrong, who has instituted a lot of these programs in his public housing, Omaha Housing Authority housing. He has great insight into what works in the welfare circles. And I think we need to use this kind of approach to wake parents up, to tell them they have a very important job to get their children to school. Thank you.

**PRESIDENT ROBAK:** Thank you, Senator. Senator Beutler, your light is next.

**SENATOR BEUTLER:** Madam President, members of the Legislature, I think this particular section of the amendment is unacceptable in its present form. And I suggest to you that it's unacceptable for a couple of reasons, to which I hope you will pay some attention. First of all, with regard to our compulsory school law, as I think you all know, we have rejected a compulsory school law for those who are above 16, for children who are above 16. So some of these children, it's not even the law that they have to go to school. So if we're not willing in here to say all children should go to school, why are we going to punish a welfare family if the older children don't go to school? It seems to me that if we're going to hold them to the societal standard, that's one thing, but to hold them to a standard that's above the standard that you have set for the rest of us is an entirely different matter. So I really don't see how logically or reasonably you could apply this kind of rule to older children who are not subject to the compulsory education law even. With regard to those children that are younger, I think the problem with the way this is drafted is that it sets no standard. It says, and I hope everybody will read it, the cash assistance provided to the recipient family may be reduced when the minor children of the recipient family fail to regularly attend school. It doesn't say when a parent fails to get them ready for school, when a parent fails to get them breakfast, when a parent fails to encourage them to go to