

system. The best thing we can do is to try to get some kind of equity in the financing. When we get that, I think we will be in a much more equitable position. I would support the amendment. I would hope it would be passed.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Nelson, then Senator Marsh.

SENATOR NELSON: Mr. President, I have a question for Senator Lamb, please.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Lamb, please.

SENATOR NELSON: I think that I support the amendment and I do have one question, though. As I understood this, this would be just about exactly similar to our Class VI situation where there is a county high school levy, but you said there was a small difference. Would you please point that difference out to me?

SENATOR LAMB: Well, one difference, Senator, is in the board makeup. See, under this proposal, say that you were going to be aligned with a Class III, that board would not be disturbed and the Class I's board would not be disturbed, and as has been previously pointed out, the Class I would have no representation on the high school board. In a Class VI, as you know, the Class I does vote for representation on the Class VI board.

SENATOR NELSON: That is what I thought so I thought this would be the same but the difference, I guess, would be the fact that they had no representation on the Class VI board, and that would be the only primary difference then, right?

SENATOR LAMB: Well, that would be..yeah, the other difference would be the receiving district, that board, would govern not only the high school district but also their grade school, you know. A Class VI is only a high school.

SENATOR NELSON: Sure.

SENATOR LAMB: The other thing I might point out is that under our nonresident tuition scheme that we have now, there is no representation on the high school district by those people who send their students to a certain high school.