

approaches that we can take are very different. The first approach is the one that the state has taken to those individuals on our ADC rolls and other types of public assistance and that is a very positive job support training role that we have set up through a system to help individuals gain self-confidence, to gain skills that will make them able to function in the marketplace, able to function in different jobs that may be available to them and we've taken a concept that I think has now been seen nationally as one of the best in the country of not trying to punish individuals for being on welfare, but trying to help those individuals to stop the need for welfare, to find work and be able to take care of their own needs, and so the state has taken this direction. The direction under this bill, however, is a different one. The direction under this bill is one that I think emphasizes the old-fashioned "make work" approach to welfare, that we find these individuals under county responsibility and find them doing different volunteer work, I believe is what the function is here, I'm not quite sure how they worded this, but the concept is slightly different from the other bill in that instead of having them dusting cabinets and blinds in county offices, they'll be doing them in volunteer organizations in Douglas County. It doesn't accomplish anything other than taking up these individuals' time and perhaps again, trying to be punitive to the fact that they need assistance. It seems to me that the better way to go would be to amend the bill and we do have amendments drafted that we could offer. I'm not sure we will be offering them at this stage or not, but the better approach would be to amend this bill and instead of taking an approach envisioned by Senator Abboud, taking the approach the state has taken which would give these people a linkup into the job support program we have in place, linkup into the training programs that we have in place at the state level and allow the counties to utilize those services and help these individuals help themselves, a much more positive approach. Now why does the county not want to do that? I mean, this has been offered to the counties to give them this opportunity and from what I understand essentially they just don't want any expense involved. There is some cost to job training. There isn't to this sort of a punitive approach to a welfare recipient, "make work" efforts, and so instead of spending some money on these individuals to help them not have to be on welfare, instead of doing that they want to instead have this sort of a forced labor placed on these individuals. I mean, in my estimation if there were some positive good that came out of it, if some skills were developed, if these people