

going to deteriorate seriously. If they go to a vote of the people under the present mechanism in the bill, the vote is good for five years. Well, I think that the people ought to be able to say that you can exceed this levy cap as long as...as the people say you can exceed it. But if we're going to have some kind of cap, I would like to at least have this amendment which says that when they vote, it's good for ten years, not five years. Or, if the school district wants to do anything less than ten years, nine years, eight years, if they want to do three or four years, they can do that. But what I'm hearing from the people I've talked to is that it's going to be disastrous if this happens and we don't replace revenues, but if in fact that does happen, then at least we would like to be able to ask the people to continue our school district the way it is or perhaps with some reduction of the tax levy, but not all the way down to one or one...or \$1 or \$1.10. And so much of school planning has to do with periods of time beyond five years. I think you can understand, if you could at least allow the people to vote on it for up to ten years of exemption, that would at least allow a decent planning period and ability to build something and know you could maintain it, ability to get teachers and know that they would be here for beyond the next four or five years. I think it would build in a lot of stability into the system if you allowed local control, a little more local control to vote to overcome the levy cap for a period longer than five years, at least up to ten years. That's all the amendment does. And I don't want to spend more time than is necessary on it, but I think it would be a helpful little piece. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Warner, to speak to the Beutler amendment.

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, it seems to me we discussed this issue on General File. I indicated then, or at least it would still be my position, obviously the period of five years is...was somewhat...it's arbitrary. It could be any period of time. The reason it would seem to me that five years is appropriate that perhaps citizens would be more willing to vote for a five year period just because it's not so far out in the future, and have a chance to see how it goes. I don't know that it's particularly important, if it's every ten years. I suspect that tends to be permanent in nature, and I would agree that allows for better planning