

SENATOR CARSTEN: The question has been called for. Do I see five hands? I do. The question is, shall debate cease? All those in favor will vote aye, those opposed will vote no. The question is, shall debate cease? Have you all voted? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 26 ayes, 0 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Debate has ceased. Now we are back to Senator Warner on his amendment to LB 539. Senator Warner, please.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I would urge the amendment be adopted. The sheet that was handed out uses the 13 million reduction that was approved by the Economic Advisory Board, and whether or not there will be further reduction or not, that is a personal judgment, but it seems to me the way you address that issue is by having an adequate reserve because I know of no way that the 49 of us could arbitrarily each decide what additional reduction might occur. Obviously, the Governor as speaking as one person can, and each of us perhaps could as one person, but we have to use what is on the green sheets and that is what we are using, and then compensate for any error by the size of the reserve that may or may not occur. But this half cent, as has been expressed by others, is for the purpose of having that option there in the event, in the event that vetoes on the budget bill or the combination of A bills is such that it would be the policy decision of this body that those vetoes should not stand. I would call your attention particularly of the possibility of vetoes on aid programs. Normally, I talk about the concern I have on vetoes on state operations, and normally I would agree that when you make reductions, why they need to be done on both sides, operations and aid, but in recent days I am beginning to add some additional concern on the aid side, on the property tax side, and we had a bill like yesterday that was passed, 345...325, that will add some additional cost to school districts. That will be a property tax increase. We have 1258 that is going to add some additional cost to local government and that will be picked up by the balance of property taxpayers in each governmental subdivision. Then over the weekend I had some people call me and they were talking about the anticipated reduction in agricultural valuations next year, and they were talking in terms of an additional 13 to 26 percent in those tracts that they had checked on over and above this year, at least in one county. And should that occur, there is going to be another shift internally within that governmental subdivision