

addition. As I indicated before and it indicates on the handout, in order to, on the bee program elimination, it properly needs legislation, enabling legislation to make some adjustments which is drawn. The bill is drawn. It could either be done in the regular session or preferably now if time worked out. The Noxious Weed Program does not have to have a bill in order to reduce the amount, but the statute ought to be changed and clarified because currently it gives them, supposedly, some responsibilities, but their problem with it is they have no way to enforce those responsibilities and so they really can't do anything the way the law is anyway, even though they spend some money. It's kind of just a review of what is going on. But there are the items. I'd be glad to discuss any of them more specifically or take up the amendments, but generally it was the feeling of the committee what we asked for from agencies at that 5.65 percent level was generally called a management program of what things that they went through, management of the agency, not do if that level of funding was reduced. In view of that the committee majority felt all of these things could be reduced which makes their percentage cut greater, but the programs or the activity would no longer continue.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Mr. Clerk, I understand we have four amendments.

CLERK: Mr. President, the first amendment is by Senators Rod Johnson and Vickers. It is found on page 69 of the Legislative Journal. The purpose is to restore Noxious Weed Program in the amount of \$24,010 and to restore \$50,000 to the Financial Management Assistance Program. That amendment is offered by Senators Vickers and Rod Johnson.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Rod Johnson.

SENATOR R. JOHNSON: Mr. President, members, I have basically tried to refrain from saying anything about the budget up to this particular point because actually it is the agricultural crisis that has put us back here in special session and quite frankly, many of the cuts that are now going to be impacted on agriculture are very sensitive. As rural senators, I guess we are in a rather enviable position because not only are we, I think, aware of the fact that a lot of our constituents in the rural areas are suffering financially and do not want to see us come in here and raise taxes if that is a course of action that we may take, but I