

has talked to me stressing that they favored it. Where are they today as we gaze our eyes around if they so nearly and dearly appreciate this amendment? I agree with Senator Landis that this is really too much of a compromise.

SENATOR CLARK: You have one minute.

SENATOR WIITALA: It is a compromise that does not satisfy those that are strong supporters of public education who work in public education and it certainly doesn't look on the surface as if it will satisfy all the needs of the Fundamentalists' churches that we have argued before on this floor. So with that, I would hope that you would defeat this amendment. Thank you, colleagues.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, the first thing I want to say is that for my part no one religion ought to be favored over another, that the Amish or Mennonites or any other group should be given a greater standing than Fundamentalists, Holy Rollers or whatever anybody would choose disparagingly or descriptively to refer to any denomination, sect, cult or whatever as being. When Senator Landis couches this discussion in civil libertarian terms it could make it difficult to speak against or in opposition to the position he has taken but I don't think it boils itself down to an issue of freedom of religion as protected by the first amendment. We know that there are laws right now that will allow a teacher in the public school to stand in the place of the parents. If the teacher can do it, the teacher does so only because the state cloaks that teacher with that power. If the teacher can be granted that power by the state, the state certainly has the right and the authority to stand in the position of parents when trying to determine what is in the best interests of the children. I don't see a dichotomy between the physical and the intellectual. These two combined to make one entity, one entity. It is not like dealing with being and nonbeing. So if the state can require the invasion of a child's body with substances that its parents' religion might prohibit such as vaccination of various types, fluoride in the water and things of that nature, if the state can require that physical invasion then certainly it can protect the intellectual well-being of the child also. I don't see this question in the sense that Senator Landis has described it. If I did, he would have my vote. If we were talking about granting all religions the same status he would have my vote but there are religious denominations that have compliance with the certification requirements already. But in looking at the DeCamp, Peterson amendment we should keep this one point in