

either we've got to put up some more state dollars or we are going to shift it right into the real estate tax system and the voters of this state are more angry at the real estate taxes than they are at the income tax and to say it otherwise is untrue. It amounts to a shift any way you look at it when we hold our line to pull an income tax cut and then watch the real estate taxes grow at 9 to 11%. I cannot buy this resolution. It is making implications that the Legislature is interested in real estate tax relief but it is going out front that we're not going to put up any money that we could do it with. It is totally unfair. It is a hoax. It is a dream-land resolution that doesn't exist in the reality of state government. I urge the members of this body to vote this resolution down with this kill motion. Thank you.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I think that Senator DeCamp is misinterpreting the rules and I think some of the other people here have already discovered that. If you'll read the rule and I know that many of you don't have handy the rules of the Legislature but under Rule 8 you'll find this sentence. Such appropriations bills proposed by the Appropriations Committee plus the allocation for the funding of A bills, all bills resulting in the reduction of revenue to the general fund and all tax expenditure bills shall not be in excess of the maximum general fund appropriation adopted by resolution pursuant to Section 4 of this rule. Clearly what we are talking about here is a maximum amount of money. So that allows the flexibility for the Appropriations Committee to come back and for this Legislature to then respond with less being appropriated than that maximum amount of money. It is clearly what we are talking about, the whole concept of this rule change which is to determine what is the most that we think we can afford, what is the most that we think we should spend this year and the following year in terms of appropriations and tax expenditures so that we are talking about a maximum amount of money, not the target figure, not the actual amount that was going to be spent. So what I am saying is you don't need this resolution. It makes no sense to consider this resolution because we talked about the maximum. Clearly we're going to talk about appropriations bills are going to be less than that amount of money and we can deal with them at that time. You would have to amend the resolution if you wanted to increase that maximum figure. That's the point at which a resolution like this would be appropriate, not to decrease it at this time. Again, we're talking about a maximum figure, not a target figure, not an exact figure, a maximum figure and