

the Appropriations Committee has already indicated they are going to come back to us with proposals that would be less than that amount and that would be absolutely appropriate under this rule change which we adopted.

SENATOR CLARK: I'd like to introduce Bart Chandler from Auburn, Nebraska. He is under the North balcony. Would you stand and be recognized, please. Welcome to the Unicameral. Senator Beutler, did you want to talk on it? Senator DeCamp, do you want to close? Pardon me, Senator Koch, did you want to close?

SENATOR KOCH: I'll defer to Senator Warner for any remarks he cares to make before I close.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, I would rise at this point to support Senator Koch's kill motion because I have to on the basis in which the resolution is now before us. It's been pointed out by Senator Wesely that the rule does set a maximum, not as a minimum and as you all know Appropriation Committee is essentially below that maximum at this time, at \$742 million and as I've indicated a few other times, if you don't like 742 I can make it a lesser figure, the committee can, without changing the budget. All we do is put cash fund lapses somewhere and change reappropriations a little, put some fees in cash funds instead of general fund but those are all poor public policy approaches and I don't endorse those but we seem to get hung up on a figure sometimes which I think is unfortunate. The reasons I have to oppose the resolution as it now stands, if you look at whereas number two, it says that the \$763 million figure could have been totally funded with no increase in taxes. That just never was true. No one in any position of responsibility has ever stated that figure. Certainly the Governor didn't, the tax commissioner has not, I did not, the Revenue Committee did not, the Appropriations Committee did not. I have no idea where that was manufactured but that statement is false so I cannot support a resolution containing those words. Secondly, number four whereas, it says that it is going to be a hold the line or a zero budget. Now a comparable figure for a zero budget for general fund money for last year would be 716.2 million, not the 736 or whatever it is in the figure. If you want a no increase in tax budget based upon some of the figures that were given by the Governor, you have to go even much below that. As a matter of fact, if you want no increase in taxes you take the \$742 million...\$742.3 million figure that the Appropriations Committee now has, you subtract the \$56 million from that of the individual income