

particular district. So a seven percent lid in addition to not having any relationship to economic reality also is unclear and uncertain as to its effect and does not apply equally to all political subdivisions. On the other side I am reluctant to do away with the lid completely because I think that the history of the last forty years of this country has shown, whether you want to call it irresponsible or not, that in effect we have not contained the growth of government at the local level or at the state level or at the federal level in this country and I think we have reached the point where a majority of the people feel that, in fact, the total growth of government, the percentage of income that is spent by the government as opposed to the private sector is now high enough, if not too high. Now I want to retain a kind of lid that at least insures that there is not additional growth, if it does not insure that there is a cutback. And so I think that the idea that Senator DeCamp and I have been working on relating the lid to personal income is an effective, a possibly effective solution. If you take the three years '77, '78 and '79 and average those three out, the average is 11.5% which would have been the figure...

SENATOR NICHOL: Time, Senator.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...they would have been working with last year instead of the seven percent lid. So it is a compromise. I think it is a workable compromise and I hope you will give it some thought so that we can really talk about it seriously on Select File. Thank you.

SENATOR NICHOL: Now the amendment has not been adopted... offered, I should say. Mr. Clerk, do you have another amendment?

CLERK: Mr. President, Senators Newell and Burrows would move to amend the bill and the amendment is on page 2050 of the Journal.

SENATOR NICHOL: Is Senator Newell or Senator Burrows either one here that would like to talk about this? Senator Newell, do you want to take this?

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President, the amendment that Senator Burrows and I offer is a very simple amendment and we are not locked into stone in terms of how it ought to be. I mean there is some room for some negotiations but, basically, the amendment moves it from seven to nine percent with a three-fourths majority of the board. Now this proposal that Senator Burrows and I, and at that time Senator Johnson, was offering in the committee to avoid, basically to avoid