

May 22, 1985

fact, a commitment to cut further it is, I believe, the assessment of the committee that further cuts will, in fact, require closing agencies, or commissions, or stopping certain programs. I think that makes it very difficult to say precisely we will bring you a \$15 million figure. We may close an agency that will generate more or less than that. I'm perfectly willing to set a figure. I would agree with what Senator Hannibal has said. We simply didn't get to that in the committee, but we would probably proceed as we did earlier. We would set a target figure and then go about attempting to reach that. But we simply didn't have time over our noon hour to reach that.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Is it your...

PRESIDENT: Senator Beutler's time really has expired. If we are going to be fair with all this list of other lights, we'll have to go according to some order. Senator Wesely... Senator Landis is next, and then Senator Wesely.

SENATOR LANDIS: I want to make just a couple of points. First I think this process is more rational. Secondly, we don't do our best thinking on the floor, as clearly evidenced by the last several days. It does require thought. I, too, think that the process is good and intend to support it. And also to undertake this with the assumption that the Appropriations Committee will not do one of the bureaucrats best of gamuts and that is to put the most attractive, most compelling program on the chopping block to forestall any realistic chance of cuts. I don't anticipate the Appropriations Committee doing that. I'm sure they've seen that enough from agencies who have done it to them, for them to then turn around and try to do it with us. But that is a matter of perception. I'm going to give them the benefit of the doubt on that. With respect to the question that is being asked I, too, would like to participate in having that question answered. If the Appropriations Committee comes back and says we left for four days, we gave the... the lobby has been going crazy for four days, and the best we can do is \$3 million, I would be disappointed. I don't have to have a dollar figure. I have to have an understanding that the goal is that amount that does not trigger a tax rate increase. I don't have to have a number to be satisfied. But I do want to have the sense... the shared sense of the goal being we are doing this extraordinary process to develop another option, besides