

consider some other state aid alternatives to education, but we've got to get those two sections out of the law. Those two sections, if we allow them to continue in place, I think will jeopardize our whole funding process. What you do, number one, is you provide for a one or a one and a half cent increase in the sales tax on the first of January, 1987. That money will raise about \$150 million for state aid to education. Now that in itself is a major jump in education support and that's something we've never done before. It also is a major jump in our budget and in our tax rates and I think we've got to be very careful about whether or not that step ought to be taken. But if you decide if state aid to education and a tax increase is worthy, then the next thing you have to do is say, how do you do it? How do you implement it? And it is on that point that I most strongly disagree with these sections of law. By placing into the law a 45 percent lid on the local property tax support for schools you essentially build in a factor that will be forever increasing our budget support for education automatically. It builds into our budget at least a \$13 million a year increase every year after this takes effect. I checked with the fiscal analyst's office. Not only will it cost us \$150 million in '87 to get up to the level we've talked about...

SPEAKER NICHOL: One minute.

SENATOR WESELY: ...then every year we have increases in the school budget which lead to the need for us to automatically up the state support to make sure we're under the 45 percent limit under that bill. That means you can count on \$13 million the first year after this takes effect, 14 the next, 15 the next and onward and upward. Well, this year in our budget we had just over \$20 million dollars. I think it was \$24 million in increased revenues from, you know, inflation and the economic expansion. So if we'd had this in place, more than half of it would have immediately been committed to a state aid increase which means all other things we were looking at would have required an increase in the income or sales tax to pay for it, whether that's sales... salary for the state employees or the University or any other state function or any other expenditure by the state. If it went above the \$13 million we would have had freed up, we would have had real trouble coming up with the money. So I'm saying we don't want an automatic factor in the law. I think this is a major mistake for us to put it