

day in my opinion, with this provision in there, a mandatory consolidation bill, in effect, in effect, because it's going to be so difficult, so cumbersome, so unfair that those Class I's are going to give up. They'll say, okay, they finally got us, they said they're not going to do it, but in effect they did it, they did it. And that's absolutely what it is. That's absolutely the way it will work. It's a common levy for grade school, which by some means is going to be all these affiliated districts are going to have a common levy, money goes into one pot and then by some sort of formula it's going to have to be redistributed to each of those affiliated districts for grade school purposes. Then if they don't agree, you know, if the local school says, well gee, we can't stand it, we're not getting our share, we don't like it, they can increase the property tax above that level to provide the budget they need. But they lose control of their budget in that Class I, they lose control. There is not a lot of difference between that and mandatory consolidation. As I stated the other day, I have been a proponent of affiliation for high school purposes because we've always heard that nonresident tuition is the bugaboo. We want to tax those districts instead of having some sort of a rebusulous formula for nonresident tuition. So we said, okay, okay, let's do it, we'll compromise. But now the compromise has turned into capitulation if this bill passes, because it goes way beyond the original concept, way beyond the original agreement. It is unworkable, it is unfair, and it does not do what the promoter said does, it will just almost absolutely promote mandatory consolidation. And I'm not willing to go that far. Each of you, I know, will vote your...the way you want to do it, and that's certainly the way it will be. But I'm just telling you now that this is not the way to go, that we need this amendment to put it in a form that is fair and equitable and accomplishes the major purpose of the bill.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Withem, please, followed by Senator Wesely and Senator Moore.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. I obviously stand in opposition to the Lamb amendment. I'd like to clarify one thing that Howard did say, and I'm sure he's not purposely misleading anyone, but he did indicate that those people who testified in support of the bill were, I think what he said was they were testifying in favor of the green copy, that they weren't necessarily supportive of the committee amendments as they came out. That is not true, actually. The