

that the people that are benefitted by these commissions are still there, the problems of unemployment, the problems with language barriers that exist, those are still there. These are the things that the commission, at least the Mexican-American Commission that I am familiar with, help out in that respect. They are a great number of people who, for whatever reason, do not voice their opinion. These are the people that don't come forward and say, hey, we need this. When the services are there, fine, they use them, but they're not the kind of people that are going to knock down your door, write you a letter or call you on the phone. The Commission on the Status of Women is different in that respect. It doesn't mean they are any more worthy and I supported that amendment. It doesn't mean that these commissions are any less worthy. I would urge your adoption of this Chambers amendment.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Warner, then Senator Chambers.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, as I indicated the other day on a similar advocacy group, there is no basis to, and I wouldn't attempt to talk against any one of them. You either make a case for all or you make a case for none. The basis of the reduced funding or the elimination of funding last time, last regular session, was a variety of criteria, one of which was the fact that there are a number of agencies already in existence that ought to or could or should, if they're not, perform the kinds of functions that the advocacy groups are doing. I don't know where you stop. I could think of other groups that probably could be justified to have a separate commission as well. There is little policy difference between them, but if you want to reduce the scope of government by reducing agencies, then you don't turn around and start restoring them either. It is that simple. True, the money is not a lot and there are probably a whole series of those kinds of expenditures, each one of which is not a lot, but they will add up. Before we get done with these appropriations we're going to be arguing about reserves and we're going to stick the state out on the razor edge again with minimum reserves, maximum expenditures within anticipated receipts which incidentally, if you follow the daily flow, cash flow, you will see that refunds are running ahead and receipts are running behind and we're headed for the same kinds of problems very likely that you saw last year, that you saw in '83, that you saw in '82, that you saw in '81 and it's easy to put the