

we really need to take cognizance of the fact that the recruiting for football is a...Senator Hall is glaring at me. (laughter) Football should not be...is any abuses, because football is such an important sport, any recruiting goes on there and not track. I've never heard of any track people recruited. On a more...or basketball players either for that matter. On a more serious note, really I oppose the amendment. I think that there are a lot of students who would want to choose for academic reasons. And what you would do by this is you would, in effect, as Senator Bernard-Stevens said, someone chooses for academic reasons or because of the offerings of the curriculum or whatever at the school, then they are precluded from participating in any sports for an entire one-year period. That...to me, sports has been a part and parcel of the educational process. It doesn't domina...it should not dominate that process, but neither should it be a completely neglected element like it is something separate and distinct because I think there is a certain amount of learning a certain amount of discipline and a certain amount of growth that occurs by participation in athletics. And it is like, in a degree, somewhat like a class in that you participate in it and you learn from it. It seems to me that the 90-day restriction that has been placed in the bill is consistent with the High School Activities Association rule and I think the reason the rule for the High School Activities Association is to recognize that there may be a danger of recruiting, but if you're going to put a limitation on it, you're going to deter recruiting to the extent of the 90-day period. You're not going to deter the recruiting...you're not going to prohibit someone who may legitimately transfer for other reasons from being ineligible to compete in sports for an entire year. I think that works a tremendous hardship on people who might transfer for perfectly legitimate reasons. As a matter of fact, in some ways I even wonder whether we need the 90-day restriction. I know that recruiting sometimes gets carried away and we hear the isolated instances in particular situations, but my thought is we're trying to look at a consistent philosophy of improving an individual's or student's educational opportunities in the public school system and it seems to me we should not burden that change, changing of districts for improved educational opportunity with a complete prohibition for one year, and I'm even questioning whether we even need it for the 90 days in some respects. But it seems to me the more reasonable approach is to be perfectly consistent with the High School Activities Association rule. The statute would be consistent with it. It