

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 16, 2003 LB 249

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Is...this is all new that I'm telling you?

SENATOR STUHR: Well, not exactly, in the fact that I know that, yes, there are some problems in regard to this area.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So why should we drop down to the high school level the problems that exist at the college level, where the NCAA treats football players differently from all other students, and sets them apart? Let me ask the question this way. If there were no athletic programs at any of the schools, we wouldn't have this 90-day rule, would we? Because it wouldn't matter when a person starts participating in music or these other things. It's athletics that is driving this, isn't it?

SENATOR STUHR: You know, it probably is. But may I make a comment that what we are trying to do is change a present statute that has a waiver provision. And what we're putting in is an ineligibility date. So...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And that...

SENATOR STUHR: ...we are changing statutes in regards to an option enrollment program. We're not...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But we're changing...thank you, Senator Stuhr. We're change...we're being asked to make these changes because of athletics. If others cannot say what it is, I will. I'm aware of the disputes that were going on among these coaches. Some schools don't play that well, so they raid other schools. They talk to parents, just like recruiters at colleges, and have those parents persuaded to send their son to this other school, where he can play immediately. And we have that kind of pressure that recruiters can bring to bear. And the student is now treated like a commodity, beef on the hook, at the high school level. And that is unwholesome. Right now, the law says you can't make a distinction between the option student and the regular student. So why do we need to change that, for athletics or any purpose? Why? Because they don't want there to be,...