

to impose new taxes on itself. It might through the 3-R plan, it might through LB 1120, it might through a straight sales tax increase, any of which impose new taxes on at least some Nebraskans. After the constitutional amendment fails at the polls, we may very well be back here debating this proposal. This amendment does not include a distribution method for the funds made available by the proposal, but there have been several viable methods offered to us by Senator Hall. We have not yet reached an impasse on distribution, always on the issue of compensatory revenue. With this amendment, there simply is no revenue. Maybe this is not a viable alternative but I guarantee you that your constituents want us to discuss it. So criticize it, ostracize it, gnash your teeth if you want to, but please understand that you have not explored all of your alternatives until you debate this item. I don't attack 1059 money. I don't attack mental retardation funding. I don't attack Medicaid. We go after the bureaucracy. I appreciate your consideration of the amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Dierks. Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Madam President and members of the body, I wholeheartedly endorse what Senator Dierks' amendment does. The folks out in the country or out in the world, the real world, I'm sure have said to each one of us, cut spending. Personally, I have answered, I don't spend your property tax, your local board and commission spend your property tax. The school board, city council, county board, ESU, NRD, those are the people who spend your property tax. Those are the people where you want to go to the budget meeting and tell what you think. Take ten or fifteen of your friends along with you and tell them they're spending too much money. But, on the other hand, on the other side of the coin, we come to the state spending and we live on the sales and income tax. We take in money from the sales and income tax and although we return a vast considerable amount of this to the local governments, we still seem to have plenty left to spend. We still seem to have money left to increase the spending. We still have money left to increase state employees. We still have money left to start new programs that aren't asked for by the citizens but that are asked for from the bureaucrats. I counted roughly 15 different state agencies that Senator Dierks wants to cut 100 percent. Personally, I feel this is too much. You can't automatically, on March 10th, 1992 completely wipe out a state agency. I don't feel that you can completely discount a state agency 50 percent. But I think Senator Dierks