

staff for instance, there is no impact on staff at the departmental level and there is a lot of flexibility in the Department of Education's budget. It's a rather large budget. They have significant amounts of federal funds which they could use to accomplish this and so if there really is a commitment to this program by the Department, they can do it. They have the resources to do it. So you're not negating, regardless if you've decided this is something that should be done, you're not ruling out the possibility that this can be done and so there is really no need for Senator Vickers' amendment other than to cost us \$30,000. So I would urge you to reject his amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Smith, please.

SENATOR SMITH: (No response.)

SPEAKER NICHOL: Any further discussion on the matter? Senator Vickers, would you like to close, please.

SENATOR VICKERS: Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I guess in my closing I would like to begin by asking Senator Scofield or Senator Warner, one of the two, a question if I may. Senator Scofield, you just said there is nothing to negate them from doing it anyhow. If that is the case, then as I read the budget bill throughout where it is broken down so many dollars done away by program or maybe even in a total elimination of dollars for a program, does that tell me then that that agency or director head or whoever can make the determination to ignore all that and go ahead and find the money somewhere else and spend it anyhow?

SENATOR SCOFIELD: Where there is a specific cut in there, specific item, and I realize that the 994 says we're removing that money...

SENATOR VICKERS: Well isn't this specific?

SENATOR SCOFIELD: But that's...the Department has its discretion to do those kinds of things within its total realm. It has federal funds to do that.

SENATOR VICKERS: I understand that they have the federal funds and their total budget is large enough to find \$30,000 in it, but if we say in this budget bill that there is no