

financial loss or anything for the district, then they can just sit back and just let their students go, and they don't care, they don't have to worry about the students that are there. They can still hold those...the students that are still there, they don't have to worry about the quality of education they offer because there's no disincentive to let them go, so they'll just sit back and let things happen as they have in the past. And it just guts out the whole idea of the concept of choice for school districts in making...and making school districts go through and analyze their program, look at their program, see what kind of quality programs they're offering, ask their parents, ask the students what kind of things do you want to see in our school? What kinds of things can we offer that will keep you in this school? Those are the kind of things that should happen with this bill. If we adopt this amendment, we are saying, yes, students can transfer, the state will pay for those transfers, the resident district doesn't have to make any adjustments to keep students, we don't care what happens to the students that are left, they are just left there hanging, and if it's not a good school system, that's their problem then, because they can leave if they want to, but they can't...they don't have any pressure point to put some pressure on the administration to make some changes to adjust their school district to meet their needs. So what this does is it basically guts the idea of choice again. It's very similar to Senator Lamb's amendment the other day. It guts out the idea of choice because we're going to pay for it as a state, we're not going to have any financial responsibility on the part of the resident district. So I would just urge the body to reject this amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Further discussion, Senator Moore, followed by Senators Lamb and Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR MOORE: Mr. Speaker and members, you know we've had some good amendments to LB 183, we've had some bad amendments. And, in my opinion, this is one of the bad amendments, whether or not you like the bill or not, because quite simply, as Senator Baack just stated, you're removing all accountability and all impact to the local district and placing it onto the state. Maybe if that's the way you want to do, but (inaudible), I mean, now, theoretically, a school district that would not get any equalization aid, now does not get any equalization aid, for whatever reason, if a student in that district decides to go to another district, that student will, in essence, get something