

home to redoing the whole system then. Senator Schmit said, well, it would be used as tax havens. It's exactly the opposite. There is no more any incentive for hiding your property here, for putting it in this district, for putting it in that, no additional chance. Why are some of the Class I's supporting it? Because I think they are facing reality. They are facing reality that maybe it's better to pay some additional taxes and have a uniform system than to have the alternatives which may or may not result in all the things they fear, I don't know. Senator Vickers said this will close some small rural high schools and I'm going to tell you he is absolutely right. You'd better believe it. At least I'm honest enough to tell you the world is changing and you can't support the system we've got and, yes, why would this close some of them? Because those that can finance education more economically are going to be the recipients of a lot of the Class I children which I think ultimately is going to make a stronger system out there. Like I say, this is the amendment the bill that should be sponsored by the supporters who are working against it. It's my last attempt on 662. I personally think 662 will fail on Final or at the next stage, but you had your opportunity to really deal with it. You've got about three opportunities this year, LB 38, that's a major one. You can establish the principle there of shifting at least on one big segment from heavy property to a lot lighter property tax. This is your opportunity to get the uniformity and clear up the loopholes, the tax havens, all those things and still not disturb the Class I's by allowing them the one thing they fear, allowing them the freedom themselves to make their choice and their decision on reorganization, redistricting, maintaining of their schools, their school boards. Now is the three-quarters of 1 percent reasonable or unreasonable? That's the only final question you should really have. Well, go check your own tax statement. Senator Hall, Senator Chizek, Senator Nichol, Senator DeCamp, pick up your tax statement, figure out on there about what percentage on your statement is being used for the high school portion. Remember, I'm not dealing with the primary, the first eight grades, I'm dealing with the high school. On your own tax statement, be it Neligh, Omaha, O'Neill, whatever, in most of them it comes out to about three-quarters of 1 percent is being used to finance the high school portion. That's why I picked that number and, yes, it represents a significant tax increase for the Class I's. The price tag? Their freedom in the other