

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, this amendment gives me an opportunity to address one of the factors that you should keep in mind. Earlier this morning, if you had that blue sheet, all of those items listed except the last three is where the Department of Agriculture indicated they would like to have the reductions made. There are seven different General Fund programs in the Department of Agriculture. Now, I'm not real clear on Senator Haberman's amendment. If it means 3 percent General Fund from each program, which I presume he means, or 3 percent in total, but if you want 3 percent in total all you have to do is strike...you've already stricken the 50,000 cut, all you have to do is strike the 30,000 relating to bees and 4,600 to animal husbandry and then you have a 3 percent cut in those programs that the Department, in their management plan, felt they could handle the reduction best. If we ignore that and just arbitrarily take...well let me say, under their management plan, one program may be less than 3 percent, another program more than 3 percent because that's where the activity is funded, but if you ignore that and just take 3 percent per program, then they can't probably do what it is they indicate they feel they can do. They won't be able to do it. So if the body wants to restore some money to ag...

SPEAKER NICHOL: Excuse me, Senator Warner, the call is raised. Proceed, please.

SENATOR WARNER: If you want to restore some money to ag, you've got to do it on an item basis. You know we talk all the time that we want to do specific cuts, not generalities by program, and to the extent that we could, where agencies identified where the 3 percent would occur and it was something that could be defined specifically to a program, we stated it. So when you went home or when you voted a 3 percent cut you wouldn't know where, in fact, you were reducing that budget, where they were going to reduce the budget, but you've got to leave them the flexibility within the program to do what they say then can do and you can't do that with a uniform reduction per program. That ties their hands so they are in real difficulty. So I would urge that you do not adopt Senator Haberman's amendment but if you want to restore things, well then pick something out and say that dollar amount for that function is not to be reduced. If you want to follow the agency's recommendation to restore money, the two things you would do is \$4,655 for animal