

May 2, 1973

correction. The school--this equalization formula goes on to identify the basis for this difference on the basis of property valuation, property valuation per pupil in effect. The problem with doing it this way is that all that this proves is that there are some school districts in the State of Nebraska where they have a higher proportion of rural property, a higher proportion of agricultural interests, where it is necessary to have a large amount of property in order to earn an in--an income. The fact is that to earn a living in the State of Nebraska, the farmer, many businessmen require extensive capital investment, require extensive property where the salaried worker, the professional man, does not require property in order to earn an equivalent income and therefore districts that high--have a higher proportion of agricultural people, a higher proportion of businessmen, find themselves in a situation where they are penalized because of this equalization formula although it may not at all be a reflection on what the income of their particular districts are. What I'm saying is that equalization is fine if we would base it on some, some system that actually identifies variances of real income and not variances of amount of property required to earn that income. If we could base it on income, fine but this formula does not do that, therefore the formula is wrong, we'd be penalizing the agricultural areas of our State, the amendment should be rejected.

SPEAKER: Senator Syas.

SENATOR SYAS: Well Mr. Chairman and Members of the Legislature. I'm in favor of Senator Lewis' amendment for eq--making this additional fund equalization. If you do not go this way and just straight foundation, if you leave the school districts in this position, the rich stay rich, the poor stay poor. You do not help the overall taxpayer of each student getting close to more equalized funds for the support of his education which I think is the real purpose of State aid. Anyone can vote a lump sum. I don't see, for instance, how a straight, without equalization, how, for instance, this bill would help Papillion to a great extent. They'd still have their mill levy to contend with and--one of the high ones of the State. Also, you penalize the school districts that do these special services and Omaha happens to be one of them, that take care of very special services, the culturally deprived and so forth, if you go to straight foundation. I, I think in fairness to the student of the State of Nebraska, Senator Anderson, and not to the taxpayer, to the student, to the person that needs an equal chance in life. I think that the proper thing to do is make it on equalization.

SPEAKER: Any further discussion? Senator Dickinson.

SENATOR DICKINSON: Mr. Speaker, Members of the body. I rise to support Senator Lewis' amendment to put this money on equalization and I simply want to respond a little bit to Senator Anderson's comments that--and I agree with him 100% except that he didn't go all the way. There are districts in the State of Nebraska, there are a good many where these interests that require--or individuals that require high investments in order to make a comparable level of income or living standards with professional laboring and salaried people are involved in high density districts where they then become a small part of the school problem if we call it that, the school enrollment, a large part of the valuation then must support that school. For instance, a district that has 75% of its valuation is strictly agricultural. This agricultural area provides 21% of the students. Obviously they are caught in a high mill levy and without the