

provide funds that were not property tax, and they are not. And I think that was appropriate. But when I think about the bills that we still have coming up that perhaps they won't pass, but if they did or in what form I don't know what they might pass, but nevertheless has to extend or tighten up property tax limits, then we would expand here as an exception. As I understand this is not a mandated program. Certainly it's desirable, I've never seen a program that would improve education that was not desirable. But also I know that sometimes you have to choose on what you fund and what you don't fund, or maybe eliminate something that you did in the past in order to fund an improvement that didn't used to be available. But I think we need to give serious concern if we're going to continue to expand the lid by exception to those items for any entity of government, whether it's schools or any other sector. And if we're going to start addressing the property tax issue on that basis, my reaction is perhaps we should start now, start here, make it very plain that as far as state policy is concerned we're going to start to limit the use of property tax and we will be supportive, as I am supportive of the amendment, by diverting nonproperty tax funds for a purpose which I would totally agree is desirable and beneficial. But I will support Senator Wickersham's amendment. I appreciate that he offered it so I didn't have to. But nevertheless, I want to support it because I think this is kind of the beginning of several beginnings we'll have about talking on how to limit property tax, but this is one way to do it would be to adopt his amendment, recognizing that the goal is right, the purpose is desirable, it's beneficial to the state, but the issue from my viewpoint here is only one, should we put this on the property tax or should we not seek other alternative funds just as Senator Robinson's amendment does.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Thank you, Madam President. I'm grateful that the discussion, in the last couple of speeches, has come around to what the amendment to the amendment actually does. And I will reiterate that one more time so that we don't lose focus in labels and defending bureaucracies and other issues, because the amendment to the amendment, which is now before you, has nothing to do with either one of those things, nothing at all to do with labels, nothing at all to do with bureaucracies, it has to do with the message that we would send to our constituents about property taxes and whether we're going to