

a long way from that solving all the maybe relatively small problems but very real problems in coming to a logical solution there and would just call your attention to that fact at this point, and I do plan to support Senator Moore's amendment today, but I would just for...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR LAMB: ...the record want to point out that this has not been worked out completely. There are a lot of unanswered questions as to how it would actually work, and that the 1991 date on doing away with state aid to schools under the present formula is probably unrealistic.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Hall. Senator Schellpeper, followed by Senator Pirsch.

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. I would like to ask Senator Moore a question, if I could.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Yes.

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: Scott, I have two districts in or I have two towns in my district. One town has about 95 million valuation and it also has a high income. The other one has about 35 million valuation and a low income. How would you see these being equalized in your opinion?

SENATOR MOORE: Well, I am just guessing. Probably the district that has high income and high valuation is probably not going to get any state aid because they can tap that income, they are income wealthy and property wealthy. Now a district that is property poor and income poor is probably going to get a good chunk of state aid because they are poor in both factors. Up to date, the only way you would measure the wealth of a school district is what sort of property valuation there is. If you can allow a district to tap that income, there is two measurements then. So if you are income poor and property poor, obviously, the state is going to come in and equalize you up to a state level, state average level.

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: So what you are saying, then, is that each pupil would have about so much income for each pupil?