

simply closes the amendment. It makes certain that there is a one-time choice, that one-time choice, of course, occurs on September 1st, 1989, when the ultimate mergers become effective and it applies to those children who, obviously, are in a high school district, who do choose to remain in that district notwithstanding the fact that there are mergers and other activities. The second item, and frankly that really is a clean-up item. I think Senator Remmers might speak to that and maybe Senator Smith but it is a real clean-up item, the second item is what I call a substantive item, not a cleanup but a substantive item. Senator Lamb offered an amendment on Select File which allows a Class I school district to affiliate, to affiliate with a Class II, Class III, Class IV, or Class V school district. The affiliation really protects the complete independence of a Class I school district but it provides that the residents of a Class I school district must now share the mill levy for the high school education of the children in that combined affiliated Class II or Class III district. This particular provision that we are putting in says, look, before an affiliation can occur, not only must there be a vote of the people of the Class I district but there also is going to be a vote of the people of the receiving district. In other words, I do not believe nor do I think that you believe that a Class I school district should simply be able to join any other district it wants to join without the other district at least approving the joiner. In other words, we don't want the Class II or the Class III district to pick up an uninvited guest. If the invitation is there, fine. Now the whole election dynamic is currently the law in terms of reorganization. It genuinely is. So we are dealing with the reorganization bill. If the affiliation concept is to be a viable concept, which I think it could be, I am not enthused about it, it at least ought to be in keeping with current reorganization law which allows a vote of the receiving district as well as the sending district. So that is a change. That is a substantive change. The third item deals with the issue of severability. As you may recall, we have provided in LB 662 that no Class I school building can be closed without a vote of the people who reside in that Class I school area. We also provided that in the event that a Class I school district is divided into more than one part following the merger that the people who remain in that old part that still has a school building shall be the ones who vote. Senator Lamb asked the Attorney General for an opinion on the constitutionality of the