

think you're going to be making that decision much more lightly and by making...forcing people to make this decision primarily when a student is in seventh or eighth grade, would be looking forward to a four-year curriculum then on what the parents, I mean, at that point in time I don't know if a seventh or eighth grader knows what exactly they want to do with their life but it would make a parent sit down and look at the curriculum that school is offering. Instead of looking...you can't, in seventh or eighth grade you really can't judge how good the athletic team is going to be and you don't know what sort of disciplinary actions are going to be going on, but by forcing that decision at a younger age, you get the parents involved in what that curriculum is going to be and make a good decision. On the other hand, if there is a student that's a sophomore or junior who seriously contends that by going to...by transferring schools, they can go to a school that's offering a more advanced vocational education program or going to a school that's offering more advanced foreign language programs, that's fine, they can do that but it's a decision they're going to have to live with. And I think, as I said, at least for General File I will be supporting LB 183 this morning. I think the body would be wise to adopt Senator Lamb's amendment.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: Members of the body, Mr. Speaker, I would not support Senator Lamb's amendment at the four-year level. I think the arguments that Senator Moore just gave were excellent arguments on why there needs to be a restriction and that's why there is a restriction of it must be for a one-year commitment. If one year is not adequate for future planning, I would be supportive, as I think Senator Baack said he would be, of making some increase over that one year, maybe to a two-year level, if that adds a greater degree of comfort by members of the body. Four-year commitment, asking a young person to make a four-year commitment is just too long, I think, to make that sort of a four-year commitment. I doubt if there would be very many people that would take advantage of the choice proposal if they knew they had to make it for a four-year time period. If the purpose, one of the main choices...purposes of the choice bill is to put an incentive, a hammer, if you would have it, to make resident school districts improve forestalling the ability of that young person to transfer back to the district after the improvements have been made, is the worst possible thing we could do. On one hand, you may be saying, yes, you're making