

as I said yesterday when we talked about selective cuts, there isn't any one of us in here outside the Appropriations Committee, I don't think, that can justifiably go into that budget and make those selective cuts and in fact it does put a burden upon the Governor. The only other method is across the board. It's crude I agree, but it's somewhat more equitable. It does allow for some shifting within the agencies. They are going to have to have some priorities themselves. We all do that at home and in our own businesses, on our farms and our families and I think government can do it also. I would suggest that we not vote for Senator DeCamp's amendment, that we support the original Beutler amendment as amended. I would encourage all of you to think seriously about it because we have tussled with this for a long time. We are not making the progress we'd like to make. We're not finding the revenues we need and I don't think the projections are going to get any better, therefore, I think you have to go with the Beutler amendment.

SENATOR LAMB: The Chair recognizes Senator Marsh followed by Senator Nelson on the DeCamp amendment. Senator Marsh, did you care to address the DeCamp amendment?

SENATOR MARSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, thank you, members of the Legislature for your time and attention. I don't like to make cuts at all. I'd like to remind all of us that it was just yesterday that Senator Beutler sent out for our perusal a list of tax rates in the past. You all keep talking about the increase in taxes that's coming. Should we perhaps more practically start talking about the return to the rate of year before last? Who remembers that last year there was a tax reduction? No one, not even the members of the Legislature it appears. I have hesitancy about voting for this amendment, but I think it's worse at two percent so I may end up voting for the amendment. But can you look at your own mind's set and say we're really not talking about an increase in taxes, were talking about retaining the tax of 1983 where it should have been since 1983 and we wouldn't be in the dire straits we're currently in? Can we look at it or do we have a mind's set that keeps saying, we're talking about a tax increase. Why don't we talk about the tax decrease? Constituents don't remember it, then let's just talk about keeping the tax even from 1983 on. Thanks.