

try to decide what's going to go and bills many time take different directions. An example would be this amendment actually is being attached or has been attached to the former ADC bill, and these things happen, and it's a good process because when you get to second round debate you get a group of people that are interested, they forge what they believe to be a workable compromise and then they present it to the body. It's printed in the Journal, it's presented to the body and there is a thorough debate on it and then, in fact, it moves on and then it sits there on Final Reading; and people again have a chance to look at what is there and they can try to bring it back for amendment, or they can try to change it, or they can just vote no but it is a good process. So to argue that somehow this is a terrible process I think is a real poor argument because it is the process, it is the democratic process. To say that you can't bring in things on second round debate to make a concept work and push it forward is really saying that we should do everything either in committee or first round debate and nothing else should be changed except for technical amendments, and that's not the way it has been and that's not the way a democratic process will ever be. Now after stating that point, I would also say to Senator Bromm, if you don't like the bill, vote against it. I would have voted against the bill. I would still have voted against the bill with the exception of one word change that Senator Bohlke was gracious enough to make. The word that lothered me the most was when we had in the...the federal law had the word "year" and to explain what the difficulty was, they never explained what "year" was. And in previous legislation they had said school year, so it was begun to be interpreted by members within the U.S. Department of Education that it might mean calendar year and that was the interpretation that they were beginning to go on and in some cases have actually made that interpretation. If you use calendar year, my objection was you'd be suspending or expelling students for potentially three semesters which would be not only harmful to the youth but totally destructive I think to the education process, and we would find that youth all in likelihood in some type of detention facility or certainly maybe in the new secure facility at some point. Senator Bohlke was gracious enough to take the word "calendar" out so we have the word "year" and whatever the Department of U.S. Department of Education, assuming it is in existence in the next few years, whatever their interpretation was I would be willing and would have to live with that because that would be it. There still is a possibility they can come back to their senses and say, year,