

dictate, I hope that we try to think of it in the broader terms that are being asked of us by Senator Withem, to consider the consequences of this and the alternatives to it. I hope we can get to that discussion as we move forward on the issue. But I think the discussion is valuable to me to put in perspective what's happening this session, what's happening this afternoon with some of the things that are pressing us into a corner and with us having to respond, sometimes appropriately, sometimes not so appropriately. Thank you.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Senator Wesely. Mr. Clerk, a motion on the desk.

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Chambers would move to bracket the bill until June 8, 1995.

SENATOR HALL: Senator Chambers, yours is a priority motion, you're recognized to open on your motion.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, in effect, this is going to give us the opportunity to see if the issue is really to be joined here. In talking with Senator Bohlke just now what developed during our question and answer turns out to be the fact. One of the requirements in her amendment as drafted talks about a necessity of referring the child to what is called the juvenile delinquency system. That is not a requirement under the federal law. These are the requirements, in general, "no assistance may be provided to any local educational agency under this act unless such agency has in effect a policy requiring the expulsion from school for a period of not less than one year", it doesn't say calendar year, "for one year of any student who is determined to have brought a weapon to a school under the jurisdiction of the agency, except such policy may allow the chief administering officer of the agency to modify such expulsion requirement for a student on a case-by-case basis". There is no requirement that this referral be made. And there are other things in that sheaf of papers that Senator Bohlke gave us that was out of the assistant Secretary of the Department of Education's Office, things in that paper are not required by the federal law. Maybe these are some things they would like to see the states adopt but it's not required by the law. So if the law doesn't require it, how are they going to determine to withhold funds? But they do do a lot of vacillating in this sheaf of papers about whether or not funds are going to be withheld. I'd like to ask Senator Bohlke