

children. This idea that a man or a woman who will not contribute to the support of children is such a reprehensible creature that anything the state has the power to do by way of coercion ought to be done is not wise or just legislating. We're dealing with what has become a hot political and societal button now and people are saying the easy way to deal with this is to drop the hammer or the entire workshop on the noncustodial parent who may not be paying child support. Since they have that obligation and know what it is, if they do not assume it, do anything that the state has the power to do. I can't think of anything worse than depriving somebody of his or her freedom. You can go to jail for not paying child support. I don't believe in that, but other people do and that has become ingrained in the law. But just because those kind of things which in my mind are not wise, are being done in the area of child support is no reason to say that we ought to transport them into the area of visitation and make the same types of bad legislative decisions with reference to visitation enforcement as we have with reference to child support. When I was at Creighton a lot of time was spent dealing with Thomistic philosophy. It's nonsensical but it's very interesting. It's funny in places and Thomas believes some of the most ridiculous things like spontaneous generation where life sprang out of nothing. He didn't realize that flies laid eggs, eggs hatched and maggots were produced. Thomas thought that life sprang up spontaneously from rotted meat and other substances or dirty filthy areas, but he was wrong. Had he observed, he would have known he was wrong. But in one of those kind of classes the priest gave an example. This little boy was sent to the store to get a bottle of milk. They put milk in bottles in those days. And he was running home and his mother said whatever you do, don't play on the way home and don't break that milk because if you do I'll kill you. So like little boys will do, he played along the way, then he had to run extra fast, tripped, fell, broke the bottle of milk. His mother forgave him. She said, now I told you once. If you do it again I'm really going to kill you. So it happened a second time because she since she didn't kill him the first time he felt that she might be merciful. On the third time he did it, she killed him, she killed him. So the priest asked for comments about this. What is your attitude toward what happened? And a lady raised her hand. And he said, what do you think about this situation? She said, well, the mother said that if he broke the milk bottle she'd kill him. She should have killed him the first time he did it and she was serious. Because the mother had said what