

100,000 now, but it increases I guess up to four, five hundred thousand. So on the basis of that first test this may be about the only thing in the budget proposals that is an absolute honest program elimination. You are stopping something before it gets started and before it gets growing. It is one of the few, one of the few. And the other thing is, does it simply shift to property taxes as so many of the other things do or is it a true honest to goodness cut in spending? The answer is from what I can learn, it doesn't shift to property taxes, it is actually eliminating something. So I guess I am baffled at the committee amendments because by all the standards that you ought to reasonably use in a special session to reduce appropriations and to impact your future, this may be the only thing in the entire budget that truly is what we call a cow case in the law. It fits all the standards for true spending cuts. In other words, it cuts a program and that goes on into future years. It stops spending and it doesn't just shift it to property taxes. So if you use those standards, you have to say this is the one thing, the only thing that absolutely you have no justification for not cutting. I know it's hard to say that, just like it's hard for me to say there might be a program or two that I have supported that needs to be cut because it doesn't meet standards. But my point is, if you're going to deal with the balance of this special session, then you have to do it kind of halfway honest and you have to do it so it impacts your future and you can only do that if you put the test to the various programs, the test being, is it a true cut of a program or simply starving a program? For example, there is nothing more dangerous, there is nothing more time consuming for legislators than a wounded Commission on the Status of Women or a temporarily immobilized Mexican-American Commission. One wounded Commission on the Status of Women can consume more legislative time than a \$300 million road budget.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Half a minute.

SENATOR DECAMP: If you're going to deal with these programs, do the hard thing, wipe them out. If you're going to deal with the Commission on the Status of Women, hard to say, wipe them out because wounded, wounded, they will continue to spend money and they will continue to prolong the agony and they will avoid your ability to deal with other issues. So I would say I have to reluctantly support Senator Chambers and say in closing, this is one of the few, maybe the only one that is a true spending cut, a true program cut and not a shift to property tax or something else. I guess I would urge the rest of you to follow that