

when valuations decline. When you do that then you have to set the levy limit far enough ahead that raises the fear of some people that there could be some additional growth. All I was saying, with the amendment that I offered, was that we wouldn't have that opportunity for additional growth automatically. Furthermore, we wouldn't have had to introduce legislation each year, or every few years when valuations decline and they hit those ceilings, to raise those ceilings. Now Senator Lamb has a bill in here doing it for the hospital districts. There have been bills in here doing it for fire districts. There is a bill in here right now, Senator Abboud is correct, doing it for the tech schools. But this, I hasten to tell Senator Abboud, is not a tech school issue in my mind. Instead I think it applies to all of those political subdivisions. I think that is one of the reasons that we are criticized for having 1,200 bills introduced all the time is because we continually have to come in and do...introduce a particular piece of legislation for a particular little purpose when this would be an opportunity, or would have been an opportunity it seemed to me to set a limit that floated, based on that valuation. Now I understand Senator Abboud's concern. I don't want them to automatically get more money just because the valuation goes up either. But it seemed to me that we ought not penalize them just because the valuation goes down. But I guess that is the will of this body. If it is the will of this body to go ahead and penalize this because the valuation goes down, then we'll just have to fight it out out here I guess on what the levy limits ought to be. But we ought not have to do that all the time because I can't predict what the valuations are going to be next year, and nether can anybody else in here. I can't predict when it is going to turn around and the valuations start increasing, or I can't predict where the valuations are going to continue to decline at an accelerated rate. So we are just guessing when we set statutory limits. You had the opportunity to not guess anymore, and you turned it down, and you still wouldn't adopt the philosophy, we're going to continue to adopt on the increases. I think that is the wrong philosophy. I disagree with it. But if that is what the will of the body is to do, so be it. With that, Mr. President, I would like to ask to withdraw the motion.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Okay, read the bill, Mr. Clerk, please.

CLERK: (Read LB 172 on Final Reading.)