

of this Legislature, admittedly not a member of the Appropriations Committee, as an active farmer-rancher in this state, to have a say about what I think is one of the important parts in looking at priorities as to how we expend our public funds in the Department of Agriculture. This cut or this amendment would strip \$74,000 which just coincidentally happens to be the same amount that we just tried to add with the two amendments that Senator Johnson and I offered to you. You accepted one and not the other. You did add the 50,000 so now we are taking 74,000 out so this would have the net effect of cutting the budget \$24,000 more because you didn't choose to put back the 24,000 for the enforcement of noxious weeds. This amendment would take 74,000 from the 113,000 of state funds that goes to the Office of the Statistician, that agency that collects statistics related to agriculture. Now I wish I could give you all the effects of that but nobody has been able to give us the effects of what happens to our cuts, as a result of our cuts. So I guess I shouldn't be any different. But I do know, I do know that the Office of the Statistician, some of their reports are going to be used to value or set up our ag land valuation mechanism based on the bill we just passed last session. So I know they are going to have to collect some of those informations. How much of that they are going to have to collect with only state dollars for state uses, I can't get the answer. I don't even know yet. Maybe Senator Warner or somebody else can tell you but I don't know. But I do know they have to get some of that information for the ASCS anyhow, for the federal government anyhow. The federal government puts a considerable amount of funds into this office. As a matter of fact our person headquartered at the Department of Agriculture for Statistics is a federal employee. My guess is that you are going to have to collect a lot of this information that we are going to need for ag land valuation anyhow for the federal government so they are probably still going to collect it. But quite frankly, and here is where the philosophy comes in, most of the statistics that they collect and disseminate to everybody in the world which they don't have to disseminate, I mean that is another thing they could cut back on, they could simply collect information and say, if you want the information, you can ask for it or maybe even pay for it. So they could cut back there as well but a lot of that information that they collect is of absolutely no value at all to the agricultural producers of this state. Now I would guess that if I took the time, and I don't want to take the time,