

entire state aid program, '92-93 and '93-94. We're still in the '91-92 year. The last year of the original three years hasn't even begun yet and Senator Lamb is in asking for an extension of two years, arguing that the time limit is too onerous, it doesn't allow for a complete look at state aid, saying that two years is an appropriate time. If you don't think that two years is appropriate or if it's too long, then just come back in and cut it if those decisions are made. Senator Lamb, I would argue the opposite. When we're talking about guaranteeing money, guaranteeing 100 percent of state aid, based on the 1989-90 school year, that the way we should deal with it is say if it's not enough, come back in and get more. Do it one year at a time in terms of the extension. Only extend it out one year, not two at a time, not a 66 percent increase, but a 33 percent increase in terms of the amount of time we're going to tack onto the 100 percent guarantee. And that's exactly what this is. It's 100 percent guarantee of state aid based on a school year that is four years old, five years by the time you get to the last year and six by the time you're into the final half of the original Lamb amendment. That is not something that we should be doing. Tremendous changes can take place over a six-year period within a district. Tremendous changes can take place in examining the state aid system in six months. They could clearly take place in a year and there is no reason that they can't take place in two years. Unless the intent of the amendment is to not begin the study for two years, there is no reason at all that this amendment, by cutting in half what Senator Lamb would do, from one to two years, can't be accomplished. It should be accomplished. We ought to be chomping at the bit for these districts to deal with this issue as opposed to guaranteeing 100 percent funding to them for not dealing with it. Argue that the state aid formula needs to be looked at, I would agree. Under a one-year extension, that's plenty of time. That's two full years left. Like I said, the original three-year proposal in 1059 hasn't even got into the third year. It hasn't even started that third year yet, hasn't even begun to run. And we're going to tack on an additional two years. It's as if, under the Lamb proposal, we're starting at square one again. We're giving them an additional three years from the time that the Lamb amendment would be adopted from which to begin dealing with this issue. It's as if the last two years were never out there, as if the last two years were never in place. And what we're going to do is continue to fund at 100 percent those school districts who haven't put off...have put off dealing with this issue. We're going to continue to