

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

April 16, 2003      LB 249

could be added to it to deal with a situation that...

SENATOR JANSSEN: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...he or she was seeing in that district. And if you adopt this, what is the next amendment that somebody might see a basis for bringing? I don't know, but I bet I could come up with some if I set my mind to it for instructional purposes. But I don't want to waste time doing that. I don't think this is a wise bill. I don't think it ought to go anywhere. And I'm going to listen to other amendments that people bring but I certainly am not going to support Senator Bromm's amendment. And the main reason, I don't even have to get to the merits, is that this subject matter embraced by Senator Stuhr's bill is not one I think we ought to be legislating on, period. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR JANSSEN: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Your light is on next. Senator Chambers waives. Senator Stuhr.

SENATOR STUHR: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the body. I guess it would be a dull world if we all agreed on every issue. And, certainly, that is not the case in this body. But as I said earlier, the option enrollment program has a long history dating back to 1989, and that was the establishment of the program. It said in statute at that time 180 days ineligibility. So when that statute was passed in 1989, we put a number of days that they were ineligible. That did not fit the transfer students. Transfer students were actually only ineligible for 90 days, but we said in statute back in 1989, and I haven't checked the record. I don't know that Senator Chambers supported that bill or not, but I may just go back and check that. But this is not the first time that we are setting ineligibility in statute in regard to the student option program. And I can't emphasize that enough, we are only dealing with the student enrollment option program. And you may have questions whether you support that program or not, and I know some senators have said, why was that even adopted, that we have more problems just dealing with it. But that's beyond the case right now and the fact that we do have it in our statutes. And what this bill, again, does is just clarify. As I said, it