

that you put into place into statute the same rule that they have now governing people who move from one district to another. At that point I said that was a policy choice to make and I said that I would go along with that at that point because it would put into place exactly what we have now as far as residents who change the district that they happen to live in. We preclude them from competing for 90 school days. That's what we have in place right now. That was the only reason I put 90 days into the bill. I don't have any real objections to one year in the bill because I don't want the bill to be one that is for...specifically for athletic recruiting. That's why I put a one-year limitation. Minnesota, they put no limitation. They have no recruitment language at all in the Minnesota bill. But I think that we don't want it to be one that is used for athletic recruitment, so I really have no real opposition to this. I think it's something that the body needs to make as a policy choice. Do we want to put into statute what we have in effect now for a resident, or I could see possibly down the road what could happen if we put this in place for one year, that you're not allowed. I would guess that the School Activities Association at that point may change their rule on what is in place now for people who move from one district to another to make them consistent. That may happen. I don't know whether they would do that or not. Since none of their rules or anything are in statute now, this would give a little more authority to rules governing recruitment than they've ever had in the past. Their inclination was, is that 90 days was sufficient because they would then have statutory authority to deal with recruitment on a 90-day basis. Right now they have a 90-day rule but they don't have any statutory authority to deal with that rule. This makes the antirecruitment language much...well, it puts antirecruitment language into statute which is not in statute presently. So I think it's a policy choice we have to make. Do we want it if we want to be sure that is not used for athletic recruiting? Then we probably want to go with one year. If we want to just make it consistent with what is in existence right now, then we would probably go with the 90 days. So I would just urge you to think about the issue and make your choice as to which policy you would like to follow. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator McFarland.

SENATOR MCFARLAND: Thank you, Mr. President. I oppose this amendment and I oppose it for emphatic reasons. Everyone knows that football is a more important sport than track and I think