

and their association with the Class Is should be no different. Senator Wickersham states that they are unique because they're distinctly different. Yes, they are distinctly different than anything else we have in the state. And the distinction is they allow for tax havens. That's the main distinction that they have is that they do allow for those tax havens to exist. I'm...my district, I have a school district that loses dollars under this. The idea was brought to me by the board president from that school district because they could see the unfairness of the way this whole system works. One of the issues that people have made this out to be a rural-urban issue. It is not that at all. The people that are getting hurt the worst are the people that live inside of the larger towns within these Class VI districts. They end up paying very high elementary levies compared to the rural areas who pay very low elementary levies. And they end up, because their valuation is not spread out, they're locked in by the Class Is, they cannot expand their district. They are surrounded by Class Is. This is the problem that you have. I think this is something that we should have addressed when we did affiliation. We should have used this as part of it and we should have provided for common levies across the board when we did affiliation and not allow this one unique system to exist out there with the ability to have tax havens. I think that we don't know exactly what this will do to state aid as Senator Wickersham has said, but it will certainly provide for a redistribution of that state aid. We have been pouring state aid into a lot of districts that probably don't deserve to have that state aid. And I think that we're going to see that shifted to the areas where the pupils are. Most of these districts that have the tax havens have very, very few pupils. And I think that if we pour money into those districts we should be putting the money where the students are, and we should not be putting it into districts that have very, very few students. The idea of the in lieu of taxes is something that Senator Withem and I have talked about some. I am willing to support that part of this amendment at this point in time, but I think in another year we're going to be coming back and having to address that issue again. Because if we're going to only go to 80 percent of value and we're going to not provide for some other kind of remunerations for those districts that have school land in them where the counties and those people get no benefit from those because they are not on the tax rolls, the only entity that gets money from those are the school districts. And Senator Withem stated that's why it was set at 143 percent of value originally was to make up for that difference. If we're