

attention to on page 3, Section 10, where we're talking about transportation. The key sentence there is, I think that the parent or guardian of the option student shall be responsible for required transportation, although by mutual agreement between the two school districts, they could provide transportation. I guess we have to assume that in most cases the student would probably have to provide transportation. What does this do? It's kind of a logical part of this whole thing that if a student really wants to transfer he should be required to pay the transportation. But look at the other side of it, you have another student who is equally deserving of transfer and he can't afford to pay transportation. This bill smacks of elitism all the way through. It allows some people to do some things that other people will not be able to do just because they can't afford it, and so as a consequence they are left, they are left with a wounded school district. They are left there with a school district that has less financial resources than it did before because it's required to send money with those students and the sending districts, for the most part, is not going to see a reduction in its expenses to any great extent. So you're going to have students leaving, money leaving with the students, and then the students that are left, that for one reason or another cannot transfer out of that district, in a lesser educational opportunity, with a lesser educational opportunity. That is not fair. Our great public system of education in this state guarantees that everybody...education. You know some countries have not had that. You had to have, you had to have the money to go to a good school, to a school. We've always had what I think is a great system of public education, particularly in Nebraska. I'm not going to argue against this part of the amendment, but I would point out that as we go along we're putting another nail in the coffin of the educational opportunity of those students that are left in the school.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Withem, please, followed by Senator Hefner.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, I was not going to comment on this particular amendment, because it's a good amendment and clarifies the bill. But a couple of things have been mentioned that I think are deserving of some response, and Senator Baack should not be left to defend entirely on his own. Two points I'd like to make are, number one, on the question of the amendments. Senator Baack has probably been the most