

that motivates us, it's the issue that will push us back into the fight that has so divided the state in the past, we don't need it, we don't want it. But if it is brought to us, I think we're ready for it once again. But I want to take time just to commend Senator Withem for the work he has done in trying to reach a compromise. I don't see him right now, but I do know he's worked long and hard and it's been frustrating to try and please all sides. From my perspective I think perhaps he gave up too much. So I can say from my perspective that is definitely seen as a compromise. Perhaps, as Senator Lamb is saying, he got too much in the bill and he wants to go back.

PRESIDENT: One minute.

SENATOR WESELY: You can see it from two different ways. I think you ought to stay right where you're at. Two sides that don't like it particularly, that don't like how far it goes one way or the other, but nevertheless compromise is exactly that. We've tried to reach a middle ground, that middle ground is reached with the bill in its current form. You go with the Lamb amendment and you open up the wars once again. Don't go with the Lamb amendment. Oppose the Lamb amendment, pass the bill in its current state.

PRESIDENT: Senator Moore, please, followed by Senator Lamb.

SENATOR MOORE: Mr. President and members, I mean I...Senator Wesely and Senator Landis and Senator Withem are very true. What you have in the committee amendments, what we'll call them, is a compromise. But the question we have to ask ourselves is, how deep do you want to drive the stake? Granted, if you don't adopt the Lamb amendment and leave the committee amendments in there, you don't drive the stake all the way through, but you drive it pretty darn deep. I guess I differ with Senator Withem, if you adopt the Lamb amendment I think 259 still accomplishes quite a bit. Senator Withem is correct. As we debated this issue over the years oftentimes it's a matter of I want to control my destiny and things like that. What Senator Withem says is, well, if it has nothing to do with taxes, then you shouldn't be opposed to the present language in the bill. On the other hand, look at the argument from the other side, for as long as we've debated this whole issue it's always been said, how come those measly, rotten little Class I's can run so cheaply? Usually the answer is that it's because they don't have to pay for a high school. And those other Class II's,