

the Appropriations Committee package.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Beutler, then Senator Chambers and Senator Lamb. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I want to make my position clear at the beginning. I am not in favor of a tax rate increase and I would accept the Appropriations Committee amendment or a 2 percent across the board cut, either one to avoid that. However, as between a 2 percent across the board cut and the Appropriations Committee package, I would prefer the 2 percent across the board. Now I sat through, with the Appropriations Committee on these last three days, I did sit through with them for that period of time and watched the process they used. And, 95 to 97 percent of their time was spent in picking out programs or agencies that they thought should go, that they thought were not within the scope of government. They use certain criteria which they considered to be objective, but the application of which I think each of us would agree is somewhat subjective and decided that a whole number of programs and agencies were going to go. They decided that without a public hearing and these people have not had an opportunity, I suppose tonight when it hits the paper they find out that they are not only on the final list, but it has been adopted, you will probably be hearing from them real quick, which makes a motion to adjourn very interesting. However, I guess we are going to proceed at this point in time. But the point that I wanted to make to you is that they did not go back. This is one big area where there is a big omission, as far as I was concerned. They did not go back and look at all those programs that you and I would acknowledge to be good, the Department of Roads, that's not a good example, but a whole number of things and say is there another 1 or 2 or 3 percent that we can take out of these agencies without hurting those programs? They operated from the assumption that the work that they had done before was final, and that they were not going to make any further inquiry into that question, and they did not. This \$15 million package doesn't show any further reductions in those agencies that we know to have good programs and those programs are good on the theory that they can be tightened up a little more. I think that is a serious omission and I think it is a very serious omission when you compare it to the wholesale elimination of agencies and programs. I really have a serious question, in my own mind,