

Legislature rejected that approach four years ago. Hopefully they will reject it again in just a few minutes and that's where we get to the procedural argument. Procedurally now we're talking about a fine tuning of per pupil expenditure. In a moment or two when we're completed discussing this amendment you will be discussing an amendment that throws out the concept of per pupil expenditure, put's in the concept of tax equity. So, if you are voting...I guess if you're going to vote for my amendment which will be offered in a few minutes, you will...it's rather moot what you do with this particular amendment because my amendment, if adopted, will basically undo the whole concept of per pupil expenditures. So whether it's 100 percent, 150 percent, 3,000 percent will be irrelevant if you listen to my arguments in a few minutes on the tax equity argument. So I would urge you not to adopt this amendment at this point.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Goodrich, did you wish to speak on the DeCamp amendment?

SENATOR GOODRICH: Yes, Mr. President and members of the body, I'd like to stand and disagree with my good friend and colleagues, Senators DeCamp and Johnson. I heard Senator DeCamp say, for example, that it should be cost alone, not one and a half times cost. If a school district plans on, let's say 100 students, and then through contracting that with its neighbors to be a good neighbor it winds up contracting with an extra 50 so, consequently, it's now got an enrollment of 150 which only planned on 100. Now, it not only has to increase its facility plant, or in other words, the size of the school, to accommodate an extra 50 percent or an extra 50 students, it would then also have the option of saying, no, we won't take the 50 students on a contract basis. And consequently, it becomes a bad neighbor, but not only does it do that, but it also says to the sending district, you build a high school for your own. So consequently, they in turn then have to build their own high school which will cost a heck of a lot more for them to do that and maintain it and that sort of thing than it would to pay 150 percent of the cost to get them accepted by somebody else. And then John brings up the other point of fairness. I really don't think the word fairness and John's proposal come anywheres near the same bill. John, it isn't really fair to the people that are sending the students to the next district to say to them, we're going to build in a roadblock