

about it. Maybe it's...maybe it's changed over the years. And, you know, does attendance help a student in school? I had one young man, it was in a small town when I first started teaching, back in the fifties, and his dad had a trucking firm. He missed a H lot of school, missed a terrible lot of school, missed all the time. Come to school, he did the best of anybody, and I thought, you know, gol, maybe that's me the teacher, but he went to the university and graduated with honors. But he was just a good student. He didn't have to attend, you know, he did well. And so I just...are we trying to overmicromanage because attendance has in my age been a problem all the time and I think, you know, Senator Bernard-Stevens talked about, you know, much more experience. And will we do it with all this, trying to force people into it? I think we have to, you know, maybe rather than making it punitive, maybe try some other means. Thank you.

SPEAKER WITH THEM: Thank you, Senator Hartnett. Senator Schimek.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members of the body, I rise in opposition to the Chambers amendment. I understand what he's trying to do, but what you would do by your amendment, Senator Chambers, is take out some language I think is important. It takes out "It is the intent of the Legislature that a process be developed to ensure communication between the case manager, the parent or parents and the school to address issues relating to school attendance." And then my amendment adds the language, "for children 16 years of age and younger." And with your amendment, as I read it, all of that language is taken out. All I'm trying to do with my amendment is take out the provision that cash assistance may be reduced. That, to me, is the offensive part. All of the rest of the language, I think it's important to keep in the bill. I think it is important, as Senator Bohlke says, that all children are in school and that they are in a position to learn. If they're not in school, they may be very bright, as Senator Hartnett said, but they're not getting the most out of their educational opportunity that they can. So I would be opposed to striking this whole section and I would be opposed to the Chambers amendment which takes out what I think is very important language, particularly the part about being 16 years of age and younger. Otherwise, you could argue that this would apply up to the age of 18 or 19 or whatever. And I'm not going to take any more time now. I just wanted you to know the reasons that I'm opposed to this. I would like to talk a little bit more when we get to the Schimek amendment.