

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 2, 1999

LR 3

programs that are already underfunded, because we're...the easiest way is to do an across-the-board cut. And you really don't add any stability to those programs. What I would urge to do, and I hope that we get a chance to visit this morning a little further, in any one given year, if we were at 4 percent, this body would cheer with their hands up, walk out the back door and say, it's been a great year. Most of this budget, you had the Governor, last year, who's complaining about that terrible, spend-thrift Legislature. You know, if we hadn't overridden one of his over...his vetoes, the budget...the percent of increase would have been one-half of one percent, one-half of one percent. It's about perception. And to the extent that that's what we're talking about today, that's important. But we need to...and I hope more people listen to what the Appropriations Committee members are talking about this morning.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Time. Thank you, Senator Kristensen. Chair recognizes Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: I would like to support the amendment. And let me tell you why. For a variety of reasons, I think trying to do this resolution is important, but I don't want to get into that. Senator Kristensen set out for you some of the...some of the negative side of doing it. I wanted to talk about one aspect of potential nega...of the potential negative side, and that is that we would pass a resolution, at this particular point in time, and then not follow through and follow our own resolution. I think that that would put us in an extremely poor position with the public, and set us up for some, perhaps legitimate, criticism. So that's why I'm...I favor Senator Schimek's amendment, because I think we should put ourselves in a position that we can follow through with, that we've discussed in enough length and in enough detail to feel comfortable that, yes, this is something we can do, this is something philosophically that seems to be the right goal, and this is something that we can follow through and actually do. If you stick with the 3 percent limitation, as set out in the committee amendments, there will be no money available for A bills. Not only will there be no money available for A bills, but you will be sending the Appropriations Committee back to deal with a \$7 million deficit in the second year out. So this suggestion,