

board 13 additional people of investigators and auditors. Within the current budget, as we understand it, they were expecting to hire two more auditors, all of which, it would be my understanding, could be within the budget that would be left. Now, this...the real effect of this is it lapses 40,000 to the General Fund but it's a reduction to that budget, but it's the other way around, it lapses that amount to the General Fund. I should also point out that the original A bill was based on an estimate of what they would collect and they have collected more than what was anticipated in the A bill. And even as the law stands, if you would accept Senator Schmit's amendment, there will still be something in excess of \$100,000 lapse to the General Fund over and above what was anticipated at the time the bill was enacted. The policy discussion, and it's not a new one, the policy discussion that would be...would reflect the Appropriations Committee's discussion, and it's one that whenever you have a new activity you look at what dollar amount of a new program can be effectively and efficiently used and I guess I would say it was the considered judgment that based upon what they have currently done, what they, at least it was my understanding that they anticipated doing during the balance of the fiscal year, that the funds suggested were adequate or would meet that requirement. Now, there is another factor that makes a big difference for the continuation budget. There probably was in the vicinity of 70 or \$75,000 of that total budget that was one-time cost, equipment cost, some office furniture, that kind of thing, computer cost. Those are not going to be reoccurring costs next year and those funds, obviously, will be available next year even at the level they are for additional people too. So if...now, it's sort of immaterial, I guess, to me, in a sense, it's a judgment call, there will be room for expansion of staff next year. Their request reflects additional staffing. The issue is how fast you can absorb additional people and efficiently use the money. I suppose Senator Schmit would maintain that the more you spend, even if it cannot be done as effectively as one might like, the odds are that you might collect more revenue and that is a judgment call I'm not going to argue with.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Forty-five seconds.

SENATOR WARNER: But the purpose, at least, that we saw was that the funding was adequate to get through what they were proposing for this year and we recognize that there will be further expansion next year, but the purpose was to keep the spending at least...or the authorization somewhat controlled so that that