

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Schellpeper, would you like to close on your amendment?

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: Yes, thank you. It just, I think, makes a little more level playing field, if the Class I districts want to assume it they can, but they are not obligated to assume it. So I think it's...and it's just on the bonded indebtedness that is there at the present time on the other school, not the Class I. So I think it's a very fair amendment. I would ask for its adoption.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. The question is the adoption of the Schellpeper amendment. All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record, Mr. Clerk, please.

CLERK: 28 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of Senator Schellpeper's amendment.

PRESIDENT: The Schellpeper amendment is adopted.

CLERK: Mr. President, the next amendment I have is by Senator Carson Rogers. (Rogers amendment is on page 395 of the Journal.)

PRESIDENT: Senator Rogers, please.

SENATOR ROGERS: Mr. President and members, I think the amendments have been handed out. On page 16, page 16, page 17, page 18 and page 18, they all say the same thing. It says, strike "operational expense" and insert "property tax requirements". What this amendment would attempt to do would be to put all the Class I school districts on an equal playing field, paying their fair share of property tax as the K-12 property taxpayers. It allows them to pay their fair share of property tax. It would provide a more constitutional posture for requiring tax uniformity, thus avoiding an unequal tax basis. Some of the examples that have been presented were that they don't take in other resources, such as public power districts, and tuition, transportation receipts, interest, wards of the county, a whole list of other resources. If the budget was ten million dollars and the other sources were four million, the needed property tax would be six million dollars. Class I's would be taxed on the basis of the ten million dollars, and K-12's would be taxed on the basis of six million dollars.