

assistance programs are concerned. Some of you know that in the Constitution of the State of Nebraska there is a provision that says local taxes, that property taxes can not be used for a state purpose. I think that under the existing program property taxes are being used for a state purpose. I believe that if we continue to ignore the legitimate shift of these medical assistance payments from the state level, from the local level to the state level, some day we will see a test of this and I would think that we would probably find ourselves in some trouble. Irrespective of the legal technicalities I think that it is right for the state to assume this burden. Senator Kahle and Senator Goodrich in LB 138 have compromised a great deal already. They have first requested that the share of the counties decreased to 5%, then they accepted the Governor's version at 10% and here they take yet another step back. If this amendment is adopted, I really see no legitimate need to vote for LB 138. Because, it will decrease that pressure that is there for some meaningful changes. So, I would urge you to oppose these amendments.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment. To arrive at priorities for expenditures is never easy. I'm sure no matter how we do it the wishes of each of us individually are not going to be accurately reflected. While the adoption of this amendment does have some assistance in terms of staying under 7% this year and also staying within available receipts, we actually would reduce the reserve we have been carrying by a slight amount with the amendment adopted. But the real reason that I would suggest support is the fact that we have on a number of occasions obligated future legislatures with mandated increases. It seems to me the approach of this amendment of obligating only the membership of this legislature, for this year and next year is a far more desirable route to go than some of the experience we have had in the past. I certainly concur with those who have spoken about the effectiveness of 285 in that we see how that works, any modifications that might be necessary next time. It has been pointed out the revenue committee and others will be monitoring that effectiveness throughout the next few months prior to next session and it seems to me with that connected with the issue of equalization of values which is still an unknown factor that hopefully will be more definitive when we come back in January, that this approach which is recognizing an increase, and incidentally I am willing to support the bill this way, which will recognize some increased responsibility for the state and yet will not be putting us in the position of binding the state four or five years from now