

March 9, 1984

LB 928

programs are not adequate, if truthful information is not submitted, why then the children are in violation of the mandatory attendance laws and have to go to public school. That is the basic structure of the amendment. The sanction for the programs not being adequate, or refusing to take the test that is required, and so forth, is the child is in violation of the mandatory attendance law and has to go to public school. Now so much of this amendment is dependent upon the parents disclosing information to the state. All we are saying is that if there is a false statement of material fact, why then the child is in violation of the mandatory attendance law. Now we have to have some mechanism in there to be sure that the information we are getting is accurate and that is what this mechanism is. Now if Senator Beutler's amendment prevails, it is going to significantly weaken it, significantly weaken the proposal, and that there is going to be no way of guaranteeing that any of the information that the parents are providing and that the educational ministries are providing is accurate. Now Senator Beutler...and I know he doesn't want to weaken it to that extent, it just doesn't make any sense to take this out. It is one of the basic enforcement provisions. I would urge you to vote against it.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Higgins.

SENATOR HIGGINS: Thank you, Mr. President. I think I would have to vote with Senator Beutler's amendment because he made the point that these parents might possibly be relying upon the minister or pastor of the church and I think the majority, the vast majority of these Christian and Fundamentalist church schools would be truthful to the parents. However, in view of the preponderance of the evidence of the lies that Everett Sileven has told, not just in the State of Nebraska but clear across the country, is it fair to these good people to let them rely on the integrity of a man who says he is their leader? It is for this reason that I think it is unfair to these people to allow this language in the bill. I won't vote for the bill, but at least if it passes, I won't be a party to a sham in pulling the wool over their eyes and leaving the door wide open in the future to put them in violation of the law when they, in