

with the amendment, though I certainly understand the intent, and that is once a student goes within a four-year system, and I'm thinking in the middle of junior high or in the middle of high school, I think we have to also ask ourselves if the family has decided educationally it would be better to go back now to the district because it's made changes, I think now the family would be under some difficulty because the child has been in a setting for four years, they have the friends, they have the association, they have the faculty and that makes it more difficult for the child I think to come back as continuity is also a major part of education for children. And I think what the amendment might, in fact, do, which I don't think Senator Lamb intends to have done, is that because of continuity the district that has lost people may not ever get the people back because even if they want to come back because they have had a continuity of four years and they want that continuity for the education for the child and it's because of those reasons I am against the amendment at this point. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Baack, followed by Senators Hefner and Moore.

SENATOR BAACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker and members, I also rise in opposition to the amendment. I understand what Senator Lamb is trying to do here and I would be willing to work with Senator Lamb on some language, you know, later on that would define whether or not they could go back to their resident district if they were committed up to four years. But the way the amendment is written now we would be making a policy choice that said you are committed absolutely for four years and I don't think that's a good policy choice to make. Senator Lamb refers to it as a flaw in the bill. I think it's a policy decision that we make. When I wrote the bill up and after I did a lot of research my decision was that you make them committed for one year. In Minnesota you will find that they are not committed for any length of time whatsoever. They can switch back and forth from school district to school district, which I did not think was a good situation. I thought we ought to have something spelled out that says that this is going to be a commitment and I think that they are making a big commitment here. And the thing...and Senator Bernard-Stevens has also pointed out that the bill is written such that you only have one chance to make that option choice. You do not...you can't continually change districts. You cannot do that under this law. You have one choice of option per pupil. So I think that that's fairly well spelled