

SENATOR NELSON: Yes, I realize. Thanks, Howard.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Marsh.

SENATOR MARSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I have some inquiries I would like to make of Senator Lamb, please.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Lamb.

SENATOR LAMB: Yes.

SENATOR MARSH: Do you feel that there would be some advantages to having input into a high school where your children are attending school?

SENATOR LAMB: Yes, I think there would be, and we have had an amendment drafted which I think may be introduced which would allow the Class I's to have a nonvoting member on that board. So there would be a person there that would represent the Class I's, would have all the privileges and rights of a board member except it would not have the vote. And I struggled with this, Senator, for sometime and I was very hesitant about introducing it because, you know, it is not the perfect solution. I struggled to decide whether it is better than the system we have now. I am not sure that it is better than the nonresident tuition system we have now but I am offering it as an additional alternative.

SENATOR MARSH: In the functioning, Senator Lamb, of the process itself, do you feel that you are keeping what you want from the Class I area? Do the parents feel that they would have more control when in fact the amendment which was proposed by the introducers would allow that same type of control under the current proposed bill of LB 662 as we have it before us?

SENATOR LAMB: Well, some people, there would probably be some people on both sides of that question. However, I think the greatest need or the greatest, the intensity of feeling is toward maintaining control of that local grade school, that local Class I under their own board, and I believe that most people believe as I do that LB 662 in its original form does not provide that. In fact, I did have, as you noted yesterday, an opinion from the Attorney General which indicated that that voting procedure had