

amendment being adopted or not being adopted. Fair, okay, and I think what Senator Lamb is trying to do here is to reduce the issue to what he sees is the nub and to offer an amendment that reduces the amount of controversy to the least amount at issue and that is the high school levy, support a high school. And I think that it cuts exactly the opposite way. What this amendment does is to cut the issue to whether or not local control is what people really want when they oppose 662. Now with this amendment, Howard Lamb and supporters of that point of view and the opponents of 662 have no transportation problem for kids. Right? Because they go to their own school. They have no local control issue because they keep their boards and they run their own schools. They have no problem with teachers because they will be empowered to hire and keep their own teachers in their own schools. It ends the problem with the free high tuition. The only difference is that you have to do away with the difference in tax obligations. You keep your local control but you give up your tax break but Senator Lamb won't support the bill. It is a trap play. In other words what I think this amendment proves is those people who are really genuinely concerned about local control and those who aren't because if you adopt the notion that what you want to do is to protect local control, with this amendment the bill becomes entirely palatable. You have the absolute guarantee of your own board, your own administration, your own teacher, no transportation, or the like. In fact what is proven by this amendment is whether or not the proponents, excuse me, the opponents of 662 are fighting it for local control or for tax purposes. And Howard Lamb has cut the amendment so that he gets his local control but he doesn't get his tax break and then he objects to the bill still. Now I will tell you what I am going to do. I am going to vote for this amendment, Howard Lamb, because I think it is an acceptable concept. It does what I think needs to be done and that is to put all land in a district that pays for high schools and runs them. Now frankly there is some difficulty with his language. Number one, it may be an unconstitutional delegation of authority, that is possible. Number two, it is a form of taxation without representation which is also a difficulty with it, but I will tell you what, I have already put off the implementation date until May of 1986, haven't I? I have asked for that so that we can solve problems like this. This concept is acceptable to me. It is acceptable to me to cut out the question of local control of the Class I schools