

off about \$15 million and if you cut off that amount, depending on what happens with the bankers bill, and I'm not making any optimistic assumptions about that, assuming that it's not passed, you're probably fairly close to a 3, 3.5 percent reserve. So this is what we need to do to preserve the tax rates as they are and I hope you will give the proposition very serious consideration.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Excuse me, Senator Beutler. (Gavel.) Let's hold our conversation down so that we can hear the speakers. Continue, Senator Beutler. Oh, all right. Senator Marsh and then Senator Lamb.

SENATOR MARSH: Thank you Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I want to bring up for you something that Senator DeCamp said yesterday when he was talking about the long, tedious deliberations of the Appropriations Committee and the fact that the requested budget had already been greatly reduced and then reduced again. I feel confident in saying that all of the fat, all of the excess dollars which weren't there in most instances to begin with have as skillfully as possible to avoid major damage, have already been done. Maybe we shouldn't have done as good a job as we did. Maybe we should have left extra dollars in there so that you could feel good by cutting out some more dollars. We're down now to the point where each dollar will seriously hurt the ongoing functions of the State of Nebraska. I believe we were elected to make hard decisions. Oh, it's easy to say we'll cut one percent, we'll cut two percent. That is not an intelligent concerned way to manage a budget, anyone's budget, even your own household budget. There are some costs which continue no matter what. If you're buying a house, if you're renting, you can't suddenly decide you will reduce that by X number of dollars. Someone else at the other end of the line also has an involvement. That is equally true with the State of Nebraska. We have dedicated employees and simply because we do not have an increase in our \$4,800 salary is no reason that other persons should not have a minuscule increase. It is not reason to cut services for the visually handicapped. It is not reason to cut services for retarded, for mentally ill. It is not reason simply because you want an easy way out to make a decision that is being offered to the general body this morning. I've thought long and hard about what could I say to catch someone's ear. Have you all made up your mind? Do you all know which way you're going to vote on this amendment? If