

is quite right. Maybe if that had been an issue and they had had their opportunity like in a regular session to make their presentations, it would be different, but as it is, the people that are being cut the three percent have come in, personally testified they can live with it, and these other people would tell you absolutely they can't live with what you are going to do to them. So I urge you to reject the amendment. At the same time I certainly understand the approach there but I don't think it is workable.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I would like to react to some of the arguments that have been given in the last several speakers because for the most part many of the objections that they raised are specious and do not really apply to the operation of this amendment. First of all, there will be no property tax increases. Now why is that? Because the property tax rates are set. They cannot go back now and raise taxes. So, therefore, the argument there will be a property tax increase simply isn't so. Read your statute books and you will find that there is no way that those tax set rates can be re-examined and increased. There is, however, a mechanism of short term financing for cities and the like and that is a warrant system and you will find that in the statutes as well so that there is an interim mechanism in the event they want to pick up those dollars without a property tax increase. However, let me go onto the issue of the homestead exemption that was raised by Senator Pirsch. Senator Warner made it clear that that money, the homestead exemption money, is not money that will flow to the counties. It will not go to the political subdivisions. Those are revenues we have been raising that we are not going to reimburse counties because the demand for homestead exemption isn't there to justify that amount of money. We are not robbing the counties in that case of homestead exemption dollars by subtracting that from the budget. What this amendment stands for is the proposition that we share the responsibility for this downturn in the economy with all levels of government as opposed to the proposition that has been offered so far by the negative speakers which is that we attempt to escape responsibility. And how much of this responsibility are we sharing with the cities and counties? I will tell you now that the amount of the total city budget that is gleaned from this source is negligible. If we cut personal property relief funds for a city, in the cases that I have checked, and there were six of them, in every case it was less than one-tenth of one percent of their total