

everybody who might be interested, in the E & R amendments, page 5, line 26 and page 6, line 5.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator.

SENATOR WESELY: Well I think values, that's one of the considerations anybody in terms of do they value work, do they value responsibility in terms of taking on a job in the work force, do they have that sort of value, work ethic would be a value for instance.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Wesely, is the term values defined anywhere in this bill?

SENATOR WESELY: I think the answer to that is no.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: You're right. Madam President, it is not defined and I'm sure Senator Wesely was not aware of the word in the bill. I'll ask Senator Rasmussen because she is at her mike. I was going to ask Senator Bohlke, because Senator Rasmussen is talking. Senator Rasmussen, since the word values is not defined and it is a specific part of this assessment of poor people, what does values mean since it is not defined and who will make that determination?

SENATOR RASMUSSEN: The intent there, since this is an asset assessment, to look at what people, what strengths people have, what resources they have. It was to look at it from their perspective about what is important to them and what they value. It was not to be done in the sense that it, okay, these are the state values and let's see if those measure up to ours. That was the intent of this language.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Why do their values even have to be brought in for a discussion because they know now that if their children don't attend school in a way that is satisfactory to somebody else, and there are other things that will allow punishment of an entire family based on what a person will do, isn't it likely that they're going to feel they had better state the right thing when their values are discussed or there might be repercussions?

SENATOR RASMUSSEN: That's always possible, Senator. It depends upon how that whole process is handled between the case manager and the welfare recipient.