

have enjoyed. So that's where my concern comes from. I hope that we're not cutting our nose off in spite of our face. I understand the rationale that...you know if the villages and the cities, county fairs, whoever, you know if they can't get the votes of a small percentage of their population to do this, then I guess they deserve what they've asked for. I just don't quite have enough confidence at this point in time that people are going to realize what's in their best interests or not in their best interests. And I understand that now I'll be accused of not letting the people have their will, but that's what concerns me. I think that what Senator Beutler is proposing here and what Senator Vrtiska is proposing in his amendment are certainly good discussions on whether or not we're going to provide a safety net, or whether we're going to continue to go on the premise that the Legislature will do the right thing when it all breaks loose down at the local level. I also think our credibility is on the line because I believe that if we impose, in fact, this type of constraint on the local level, we better be getting ready, the next time we work through the budget, in providing a similar reduction in the state's budget, because I will state again that people are not only upset just about their property taxes, they're also, if you ask them, think their income taxes and sales taxes are too high also. So we can think about that as we start working on the state budget for '97-98, '98-99 also. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Senator Maurstad. Senator Beutler, followed by Senator Schimek and Senator Pedersen.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Bernard-Stevens, members of the Legislature, I just wanted to reflect upon some of the comments that were made and some of the ironies of this particular debate. It's indicated that if we put some kind of funding or some kind of indication of possible funding in here that it would be vetoed by the Governor. I don't think that would be the case. I suppose it's possible, everything is possible. But why would the current Governor make the next Governor a one-term Governor? I mean if we don't put the money in now, if that decision is not made now, and if everybody is telling me, well that decision will be made in two years, nobody will abandon the schools, we'll put this money in two years from now, well there's going to be some Governor sitting there, two years from now, and he or she is going to realize that this is major, big time decision, and how can we be sure we won't get a veto then,