

the Class VI board. They also have representation on their local level of their Class I school. And so it is an option. I am not saying it is right or it is wrong. I am simply saying in some cases in this state, I am think most exclusively in the western part of our state where there may be great distances to travel, that this may be a lucrative offer for some of those school districts that are out there. Needless to say, the cost of building a new school site may prohibit anyone from using this particular option but I am simply saying let's put it in the statutes again and allow them to form a Class VI if they choose to do so or the people in that area choose to do so. That is the amendment.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Landis, your light is on. Did you wish to talk to this? All right.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, there is a vast difference between the Lamb amendment and the Johnson amendment. I oppose the Johnson amendment and I will tell you why. There is no reason for new small understaffed high schools out there. Every kid in this state is going to a high school now and they are doing that because of arrangements either because they are a student there and they are a part of that district or because they are a free high tuition student. Now the Lamb amendment has taken care of the problem of maintaining local control, but with the Johnson amendment, you have to proceed on the notion of new construction, new buildings, adding to the fixed cost of education. There is no rationale to do that that I know that is cost sensible or feasible and what we are simply doing is creating a possibility of spite high schools that will undo what we have out there now. High schools are now fighting the difficulty of declining enrollments. To increase the number of high schools is to threaten all of the high schools that are out there, to make them...to divide their student body up into smaller and smaller groups, making them less and less efficient, more and more cost top-heavy, more administrators, more buildings, more gymnasiums, more buses, you don't need it. If you want to protect local control, the Lamb amendment which this body just agreed and just accepted does that, but to allow new Class VI's is to build new high schools in areas that already have tough times with keeping their Class II's open with the minimum student body of 25. And for that reason I oppose and oppose vigorously the Johnson amendment. This is not an option that should legitimately