

tax, but, no, we're going to pick on those people on their income. So I just wanted you to know, to see these tax facts to know what you're doing. You're raising now the highest tax that we tax the people and that is on their income. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Members of the Legislature, I rise to oppose the Haberman amendment and to rebut this run of arguments on LB 35's fate. First, with respect to the argument that what we're missing is the opportunity for vertical cuts. Take a look at this sheet, run your finger down it, take a look at anything and show me a vertical cut. It's not there. I'll tell you what is there, \$11 million of state aid. \$11 million of what? More property taxes? Agricultural land is 40 percent of the valuation of this state and we are going to turn this money into property taxes and that is going to help agriculture? Hardly. The argument is that this is what? Vertical elimination? It's not. It's a scorched earth policy. It is a starvation of everything under the sun, not a vertical cut, not a restructuring. If there has been a contraction of government, by the way, this Legislature has done it and we've done it already. We did it with our \$17 million of votes. Those cuts for the first time in living memory have reduced the total state budget from the previous year. So we've already had our contraction. I recall the debate on the cigarette tax and I don't think individuals were mocked. I do think that a lobbying effort was mocked. I recall Senator Lamb standing up here wasn't mocked, but he was certainly angry with the University for sword rattling on the Curtis situation and tried to get some law written in, and, as a matter of fact, to stop that kind of lobbying. Lord forbid that we should leave the University the right to stand up and kind of sword rattle on its own. Better kind of put a gag on them so that they don't lobby in that way. Kind of like the gag that perhaps we would have liked to have offered for some of the lobbying forces on the cigarette tax. I don't think individuals were mocked. I don't think people were mocked. I think there has been a great deal of attention, not only to what people's current wishes are, but also what their long-term interests are and their interests in some of our assets here in the state. Seems to me that the characterization that this is our chance for some vertical cut in the size of state government