

still an issue but it didn't show on the surface, as you all know, a lot of strength yesterday. The concept of increasing state income taxes doesn't have overwhelming support and I am happy about that. I think that is good because it gets us to what Senator Goll said one hour ago. He said you can either increase revenue or you can decrease spending. Now when we talk about decreasing spending, I think for many years all of us have committed a fatal error, myself included, myself more guilty maybe than anybody, and that fatal error was what I alluded to yesterday in thinking that the only budget that counts is the one we have sitting in front of us that all the media attention is given to when, in fact, the real spending of this state is at the local level, three times as much as what we are talking about here at a minimum. So if you are really dealing with spending, you are going to have to resort to exactly...yeah, what he did in Washington, a guy named Ronald Reagan. He started forcing it on down the line. When he cut out major percentages of the supports the feds were giving to us on programs, we reacted or we have started to react, and that is to eliminate this program, to make this cut to deal with it. As a Legislature, we have never done that with state or local county or local government, county, city, schools, and the statistics to prove this are abundant. We are right up there at the very top in the United States in the number of local employees, local government employees. What we have done, if I could use a real simple example, is exactly this. As a state senator, I earn \$400 a month, the same as everybody here. Everybody also knows you can't live on \$400 a month and maintain a family so we work or have other incomes. Let's say we have another income of \$1,500 a month. We have tried for years now, the last several years, to make all adjustments for our new expenses in only the visible part, the \$400 we are receiving from the state. That is exactly what we have been doing at the state level, make all adjustments in the limited amount rather than dealing with the entire picture. We have abandoned state government in our failure to look at the big picture and the big picture is the total government spending in this state, and that is what this amendment deals with. Here is what it does. It imposes a 1 percent across-the-board, exactly like Senator Warner talks about for 2 or 3 or or 5 percent and that totals about \$6 million. But then, but then it deals with the heart of the issue which is local government spending. It imposes an additional 5 percent cut in the amount the state is providing, the state is providing to