

and address only the consideration of the high school levy, but the difference is it is not acceptable to Howard Lamb and it isn't acceptable to the opponents of 662. What I think that reveals is they have no intention of giving up the preferential tax treatment that they have. I could be wrong. Let's see what happens. If this amendment gets adopted, let's see whether the opponents then close up their shop and say we have got our local control, we keep our boards, we keep our schools, we keep our districts. All we do is do away with free high tuition, all we do away is with our special tax obligation mechanisms that we have, and we can live with that.

SPEAKER NICHOL: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: We accept the goal that everybody should support high school education under the same form of a levy that everyone else does. We will see if they really mean it. I don't think they do but I will tell you what. I will be happy to be proved wrong. I support the Lamb amendment.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Haberman, then Senator Rod Johnson.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Mr. President, members of the body, a question of Senator Lamb.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Lamb, would you respond please?

SENATOR LAMB: Yes.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Senator Lamb, underneath your amendment, for these people in the Class I districts, as I understand it the high school board would set the mill levy, is that correct?

SENATOR LAMB: Yes, same as...

SENATOR HABERMAN: Would the Class I districts then have any input or any representation on that high school board?

SENATOR LAMB: No, there would be none.

SENATOR HABERMAN: So, therefore, whatever the high school sets as a mill levy, that is what it is going to be. They will have no input whatsoever.