

doesn't affect the overall substance, goals, intent of the bill itself? It would be my belief that you can't really throw that out without affecting what was the goal and intent of the Legislature and our perception when we adopted the amendment and, therefore, you can't reasonably sever it even though you are putting language in to do it. In other words, it would topple the entire bill so my question would be, would you deal with the severability? The second question, originally this battle was portrayed from the very beginning as a battle over tax equity versus reorganization, mandatory closing of schools, losing of local control. As I read the bill now, and I would like you to tell me whether you feel I am wrong on this, as I read the bill now the tax equity has almost been lost because it appears to me that Class I's really have basically the same options, the same amount of cost or even less, that they have under the free high tuition program and that really all you have done is gone in a circle and you really are having another form of free high tuition, and that the only thing left in the bill is the one thing you said was never going to be the intent which is reorganization and closing "of schools". In other words the very thing you said was the whole goal of the bill doesn't exist any more. Hell, the costs are the same. You have got a half a dozen ways, in fact they are less for some school districts going to be than they are under free high tuition.

SPEAKER NICHOL: One minute.

SENATOR DEKAMP: I guess I am wondering, have you gone to the other version now? Is it no longer tax equity and "reorganization". The third question I have, is the Schmit amendment which by law, I repeat by law, would have forced a refinancing of the school system, is it being struck and is in fact nothing more than laudatory language about the goals in the future being inserted in its stead which has no binding effect whatsoever upon the Legislature and which merely does nothing any more than us passing a resolution saying we want to refinance the school systems in 1989 or sometime? I repeat, would somebody address the severability issue, the tax equity versus the reorganization issue, and whether in fact the Schmit amendment is being struck to cause that effect?

SPEAKER NICHOL: May I introduce some guests please in the north balcony, guests of Senator Marsh, there are 75