

So I think we need to be very careful that we keep up-to-date. The last thing I want to happen in Nebraska is that we fall into default and cannot maintain our pay as you go basis that we have had and I think one of the things that we need to do right here now is to pay as we go and to see that we accomplish what we set out to do and I think the Warner amendment comes as close to that as anything I have heard at this session. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I am going to be in the position of opposing the Warner amendment this morning and I am going to be opposing it because I think there are two basic problems with the amendment. Let me talk by way of analogy a minute. In the first place I think that the Warner amendment is all backwards and this is what I mean. A hunter goes out and brings home some game and he dresses the game and he divides it into two piles, the fat and the scraps that he doesn't need and the lean meat. Now what is happening with the Warner amendment is that we are getting rid of the lean meat and we are keeping the fat and the scraps. What I am opposed to in the Warner amendment is basically the reduction in the state agencies by three percent when our Appropriations Committee has not had an opportunity to review those agencies and determine whether that is really fat. The process has been so rushed this special session that only eighteen of the ninety-five agencies, eighteen or nineteen of the ninety-five agencies have come before the Appropriations Committee to explain what effect that three percent reduction would have. But Warner's amendment increases, in fact, that reduction to state agencies over the Thone amendment which also contained that kind of a reduction. Then what happens is that the \$4 million in cash fund lapses, which the Governor himself identified as excess, the capital construction deferrals which are not really necessary this year as we all know, the \$5 million in reductions in excess of three percent which the Governor identified as fat are not reduced in the Warner amendment. So in other words all those items that are clearly fat, the cash funds, the construction deferrals, all those we leave in and we reduce the state agencies. I am suggesting it should be the other way around, strike the cash fund, strike the capital construction. Then next year, two months from now when we come into session, we can make a decision as to whether we want to reinstate the cash funds, whether we want to reinstate the capital construction and we can make that decision at that time after a thorough review of all ninety-five of the state agencies so that we can ascertain the relationships of cuts