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**Quick Assignment No. 2:**

**Government-sponsored Programs for School-age Children**

The prevalent concern of “latch-key” children and such a situation’s implications have provoked many a response to find more suitable resolutions to ensure proper care and safety for youngsters--and often on a government level. Such regulation is perpetuated, at which times countless parents have proven unable, for whatever reason, to provide solid, three-square meals a day for their child(ren), or even just a decent breakfast before school. When one evaluates the amount and the quality of the various government-assistance programs offered in this country, s/he must come to question, “Is it enough?” But maybe another inquiry should be included for consideration, such as, “Is it too much?”

The frequency, quality, consistency, and brevity of government involvement in a child’s upbringing are all interconnected facets that help to dictate to parents whether they should be appreciative of such aid, or simply take whatever measures necessary to handle their own affairs, especially at which point the welfare of the child is concerned. I argue that so much money is being “dumped” into these kinds of programs that a parent’s level of self-sufficiency is reduced, thereby depriving other valuable resources of necessary funds that could further benefit the parent/child relationship--such as investments within the arts in schools, libraries, school supplies, at-home education-environment systems (like interactive language-learning programs), field-trips, et cetera. These are activities that, if more frequently and carefully funded, could greatly benefit parents and children, alike, that if a child is forced to arrive home without a parent to greet him/her with love and/or nutrition, the negative effects of such a circumstance are decreased.

This does not mean I am advocating a drastic depletion of government aid all-around. I am simply suggesting that such monies be placed in areas pertaining to in-school and at-home activities, and not just toward dinner tables or in parents’ purses or pockets. At this time of money-receiving, parents may just realize that such funds would have been better allocated *directly* toward the very items which the government intended the parents to purchase, themselves--such as trips to the local art museums (which the government, itself, should sponsor, without parents’ payment on behalf of the child) or instruments (like recorders) for a fourth-grade assembly recital. Indeed, with more careful placement of the state’s monies, parents, themselves, would need direct financial assistance a lot less, thereby assuring us citizens that the money we have left is being well-spent.