

revenue year and then we were doing bad things with a series of appropriation reductions, elimination of programs, across the board cuts which always looked to be painless but in every event eventually show some very serious problems. While I appreciate that if you adopt this amendment you are taking away the opportunity of some investment of public funds into worthy programs, in the long run what you are doing are preserving the investment in a lot of programs by having some funds on hand when we hit difficult times, which I think are inevitable. So I would urge that the amendment be adopted, provide some additional cushion that may well be necessary within the next three years.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Discussion on the Warner amendment. Senator Hall, followed by Senators Moore, Haberman and Wesely. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President and members, I rise to oppose Senator Warner's amendment to LB 525. The issue was addressed at the first stage of debate of the bill and it was to remove the \$50 million that was included in the bill when it came from the Appropriations Committee. I don't think that reducing it 20 percent makes it a better measure. I understand Senator Warner's arguments with regard to concern about projected spending down the road. But I think we have to bear in mind that the spending, much to the tune of 160 odd million dollars is through...and I'm speaking specifically of LB 84 and LB 814, is what we have all called one-time money. LB 84 clearly is in a one-year program. LB 814 is spread over, I think, four years, the total dollar figures in there, and those are monies that, hopefully, will be available again to readdress issues that are before the Legislature. Now the argument that, based on all things as they are, we cannot have a flat revenue year and I would say that that's probably fairly correct but you're also accepting the fact that we're going to continue to increase the budget by 5 percent, that some things aren't going to fall out, that that one time...those one-time expenditures are going to continue to be part of the budget bottom line and that we don't address revenue issues. Now Senator Schmit coined the phrase of the nonrevenue Revenue Committee a couple years ago and I guess one can make the argument that that is the case again this year because there was no...little at all tax increases that came out, but it's my intention to address the issue of expanding our sales tax base and we have introduced interim study to do just that. I don't think that we should sit