

have to be at \$2.30 in that particular year. We can be down to 2.25 or 2.20, but in order to give the public the commitment I think we should give them, if we are going to do this, we ought to be down to at least 2.30 at that point in time, and that is what this schedule would purport to do. Now there will be some who say, well, we can't...we shouldn't be so specific, we shouldn't try to do just this or just that. But, folks, we are talking about a nickel a year. If we can't figure out how to do at least a nickel a year, we are not serious about this, and on the other hand, if we are trying to give the public the idea that we are going to do all this in two or three years, I'd suggest again we are not serious about it because we can't do it in that period of time. We will never come to agreement on how to do it in that period of time. And so I am throwing out for your consideration the idea of a marked incremental schedule for getting down to where we want to be over a period of ten years in what I think are increments that we can actually do, that we can actually bite off and accomplish, and I throw that open for your discussion. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Wesely, do you wish to speak to the Beutler amendment?

SENATOR WESELY: Yes, Madam President and members, I appreciate Senator Beutler's amendment, but I did look at the language in resolution one more time because I thought his concerns were very valid. In my reading of the resolution under levy caps, which is number four of the resolves, the last sentence says, "Ultimately, it is the goal of the Legislature to achieve viable levy caps at no more than two dollars per one hundred dollars of valuation" which would seem to me when you use the term "ultimately" that it is to be phased in over a period of time. So I think he is in more detail outlining essentially what I thought we were going to try and do in any event under the terms of the resolution. But let me back off a little bit because he is making an excellent point, and it leads to additional points that I would like to make with the resolution. I have been targeted by the World-Herald in an editorial that came out a few days ago about my zeal for tax shifting to income and sales tax, and I want to indicate to you that I have very little zeal to do that. In fact, I have opposed some efforts in the past to accomplish that very goal, as Senator Withem knows, but it seems to me that we have, in fact, an opportunity here that is different than some other efforts that are getting mixed into