

is just \$25,000, kind of a test case. In order to do that, we have to introduce a bill to cut the Athletic Commission in this case. Next year it will be a series possible of bills for millions of dollars of cuts. That bill is referenced to the appropriate committee, in this case it was the Government Committee, and they hold a hearing. And in almost all cases that I can imagine on cuts, and certainly it's the case on the Appropriations Committee, very few people will come in and argue why we need to take a painful cut, with the exception of those that are...have to balance the budget. For the most part what you're going to have in all the hearings that I can imagine, or for the most part a high majority of the hearings, are exactly what happened in the Government Committee, the Appropriations Committee appearing and telling the committee why we had to make a cut, and why we did, and then you're going to have every other person there testifying against making the cut, because every cut affects some entity or some group and they don't want the cut, that's how the system works. And the committee reacted to that, as most committees would, and said, you're right, it's a good thing, we shouldn't cut it, and they killed the bill so that we now do not have to make the cut. Now the committee is saying we need to put the 25,000 back in because we're not allowing the cut. If this is the process that will take place next year, we're going to have very, very serious problems in the process of an Appropriations Committee trying to bring forth a balanced budget, but another process that denies that chance of ever happening. One of the suggestions that I'm rolling about and talking to people is the suggestion that we may have to have a rules change for next year's session, and that rules change would be that the process does not change. The Appropriations Committee still introduces a bill that would be for a particular cut. We want to open the process, it's referred to a committee, the committee holds its hearings. One of the things that I'm thinking about that might be helpful, at that point, that after the hearing the bill would automatically advance back to General File with that committee's recommendation. And then at that point, when the bill would come up for discussion, we would be discussing the cut. The Appropriations Committee would be on the floor pleading its case, the other committee would be on the floor with its chairman and members saying why that shouldn't be done. And both of those then would be discussed on the floor, and it truly would be a legislative decision as to whether or not to take the cut in the micro sense that the Committee of Government was looking at, and in the macro sense that the Committee on the