

about fifteen or twenty thousand dollars and save a couple of hundred thousand dollars because of some technicalities and things on federal funds. So I think it is an imperative amendment, that we adopt it. I know Senator Labeledz has been concerned about it and she had a version of it. I support the amendment either in the Warner version or the Labeledz version or a combination of the two but one form or another it is an important amendment to adopt. It picks up an extra couple of hundred thousand dollars that we will lose otherwise and so I would urge you to do it. It only costs, what, twenty grand or so?

PRESIDENT: Senator Labeledz, you are next.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Thank you, Mr. President. I support part of Senator Warner's amendment and I did have an amendment to the amendment upon the desk but I had to withdraw that because I was striking the entire Warner amendment and adding mine on the Commission on Aging. But by doing so I strike the entire amendment and I certainly don't want to do that because I approve of what he is doing. It seems now like I will have to offer the amendment on Select File which I would have preferred to have done today but I would like to explain to you why I do disapprove of what he is doing on the Commission on Aging. The Commission on Aging was appropriated \$207,081 general fund for administration. The three percent cut which amounts to \$7,368 and what he is doing is adding the \$10,716 reduction in aid which would total \$18,084 which is a 8.7% of the \$207,000 for administration. I don't believe that the Commission on Aging should receive that high of a reduction percentagewise for administration compared to the other agencies three percent. So what we are doing is we are raising the operations 8.7 rather than 3 and I object to that. From the figures that I have, the state funding has been increased very small over the last three years. In 1980 it was only \$194,000. And then in 1981 it went up to \$206,000, and in 1982, only \$207,000. The \$6,000 or \$7,000 cut that was originally in the operations costs would result in some services for the elderly, a number of issues on the newsletter Voice, and I don't think that we should more than double the Commission on Aging's reduction of say 8.7 percent when the rest of the agencies are only getting 3 percent. I think it should be a 3 percent across the board and not single out the Commission on Aging for an additional cut. But because I don't have the amendment ready today, I will have to do it on Select File but I thought the information beforehand would be helpful, that we should not increase that over the three percent operations cost as called for in the Governor's budget. As far as the two commissioners that appeared at