

morning, and I explained very simply that I think we have to do things that actually eliminate spending rather than shift it. I suggested maybe we ought to look to some other areas. I certainly realize the problem Senator Warner has raised, that is, okay, where do you look? I guess I think there are some things, and maybe some of them could be offered. If they would be offered, it might eliminate the need for this. But let me raise a more fundamental issue and show you why I guess I think you may be trapping yourselves a bit on this. It is 1.9 million. Okay? But not really, because if you cut 1.9 million, that is for half a year. As you all know, this isn't projected for half a year. The intent and the goal is that it be double that amount next year so it has some impact, so it actually reduces next year's expenditures in this room, 3.8, or whatever. Anyway, it gets you up to about \$6 million. Now, when do you get that \$6 million makeup? It is all going to have to be loaded into the next property tax round, can't be done retroactively, can't be done like we are doing it. It has to go on the next hump. That is a pretty good hit of new property taxes in a state that is right there at the top and in a state that the research from, I think, the Nebraska Research Council, and the experience of the Revenue Committee, and the experience of this Legislature itself is, property taxes are the biggest burden and biggest pain in the state. So, if your solution here is simply to increase the biggest pain in the state, I am not sure you are accomplishing anything. Now, I would like to raise a possibility. If the amendment, or if the proposal that is cutting the 1.9 and the 3.8 million, if that proposal also said, and at the local level you will, in fact, eliminate this program, and this program, and this, in other words, if it actually cuts spending all the way down the line so it was a total cut in tax spending, that would be one thing, but it isn't that. All it is is we are taking money away and they will now raise it on property. There is nothing to suggest otherwise. You are just shifting it. So, that is the reason I am hesitant, I am hesitant about doing it this way. There must be some amendment, there must be some way you can change it and so it goes on down the line. You are giving state aid to education that flows on down the line. Why can't you give the instructions? Why can't you make that aid contingent upon cutting some programs, or meeting with proven action the actual cuts? Otherwise, you are just increasing property taxes. That is my problem with this particular cut.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Vickers, please. Then Senator Hall.