

I, too, rise in opposition to Senator Beutler's amendment. I think that, and I am not saying that his approach is not all that bad, but at this late date without a public hearing, people to come in and express themselves. I would agree with Senator Koch, it is not a good procedure. I am sure that as we go on down the road with the lid that we have had for two years now that people are going to understand and if they do and like it, they will continue. If they don't they are going to tell us. But I believe until we reach that point and we are asked to make changes, with a strong voice we should leave it where it is at and, Senator Beutler, a good friend of mine too, if you believe so strongly in this and this is the correct and good answer, I would suggest that you come in with a bill next year. Let's have the hearing on it. Let's get the input, both pro and con, and make our decision then. I think it is poor timing to do it now. I do think the amendment that we did put on 352 was worthwhile and needed because of the potential and reality that is going to hit us. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Newell.

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President and members of the body, I rise to oppose the Beutler amendment and I will be very brief. It is very similar to other proposals that have been kicked around, in fact, probably the most popular kind of ratchet or indexing sort of proposal has been the CPI or certain other indexes which should really deal with cost. I think frankly I am going to oppose the Beutler amendment purely on that argument only. That income is a fine thing to look at and there has been good years when incomes went up and taxes haven't and there has been bad years when taxes went up and income did not quite do as well but that has no relationship at all with needs or spending and for that reason I oppose the Beutler amendment. I think the CPI indexing would be more logical. Now frankly I will admit that I wouldn't support that either and I have a real problem with the lid and I have always had philosophical difficulty with the lid and have become a real convert and supporter of the lid during the special session and since that time because frankly, it has provided us with a political solution to a political problem. The problem is that the people of this state think the government is spending too much money. There is no question that they believe that. They have different priorities than you and I and different priorities from each other but they want the lid. Polls have indicated they want a lid. 7% is arbitrary but frankly I think it is less arbitrary than a 5% constitutional lid and that is why I support this proposal. I mean that is