

5 percent cut on the state level. Now the Appropriations Committee has recommended a 3 percent cut pretty much across-the-board. Now that is about \$19 million. I understand this amendment reduces that amount of total cuts to about \$16 million, so we are going backwards. Nineteen million dollars is not enough to balance the budget according to most estimates. So it looks to me like instead of going back to 1 percent on state operations we need to keep 3 and possibly 4 percent. If we had 4 percent across-the-board for state operations plus 4 percent for local subdivisions, then you are getting in the ball park of the amount of money needed. But everybody says, well, 4 percent is way too much for state government. Why is it too much for state government? You know, the price of corn goes down 4 percent and you don't even notice it. People don't even think anything about a 4 percent reduction in the price of some products or an increase of a like amount. We are used to increases and decreases on the order of 15 and 20 percent and it continues to baffle me why a 3 percent cut is so devastating. Three percent is not a big cut. Three percent is not a big cut, but why should we have a 5 percent cut for one area of the state and a 1 percent cut in state government which won't even be noticed, which will not reduce the amount of money enough to even make it a real difference. I oppose the amendment. I hope you will too.

SENATOR MARSH: Senator Vard Johnson.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, Senator Hannibal made a point that since he has been in the Legislature we really haven't increased aid to local subdivisions, in fact, aid to local subdivisions have been declining right along. The truth of the matter is that we have always been interested in what happens to local subdivisions and we have increased aid. We have increased it in a variety of forms. I notice from a little chart that I happen to have that in 1978 and '79, cities, counties and schools collected \$9 million from the premium tax. By 1985-86 that was \$15 million. I notice from a little chart that I happen to have that local government, schools, in 1978-79 collected \$18 million in our special education program. By 1985-86 that was \$48 million. And I could go on and on and on. This year alone, this year alone we increased the documentary stamp tax and we increased the allocation to county government on the documentary stamp tax so that the county government would have more revenues.