

Committee has made the proper judgement. The Ag 40 Committee certainly wants this. They'd take \$5 million, \$10 million, or \$20 million. But I think that the priorities have been established. I think the Agriculture Institute has been treated most kindly in terms of the amount of funds from the Appropriations Committee. I think, Senator Kremer, in a friendly spirit I say this to you, that little pig on the end is quite undersized. In fact, that little pig on the end ought to be the biggest boar I've ever seen in my life, particularly when you feed him \$15 million of corn that we put in capital construction for those programs lately. Probably it's a visual misunderstanding by me. Maybe it's my glasses, but I think you have it considerably undersized. I appreciate Senator Kremer's effort. He's one of the finest people I know. I know it was an artists misrepresentation and not a misrepresentation on the part of the offerer of that amendment. Again I state, I am adamantly opposed to the amendment.

SENATOR MARVEL: There are committee amendments, but since we started on this amendment we'll proceed. Then we'll go back to the committee amendments. This is the way I've got the lineup--Senator Warner, Senator Hefner, Senator Dworak, Senator Richard Lewis, Senator Barnett, Bereuter, Carsten and George. Senator Warner, do you wish the floor?

SENATOR WARNER: Yes, Mr. President.

SENATOR MARVEL: Senator Koch, right.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, very briefly. I rise to again oppose an amendment that I would personally like to support. But I understand very clearly if you're in a tight budget, and we are, if you're going to make cuts you better start looking at your own interests to make cuts first. If you're not going to approve increases you better look at your own shop first, just as a matter of equity. The basis on which the Appropriations Committee arrived at their decisions on post secondary education, as I explained it, on General File we established a priority of five different items without looking at the dollar amounts, then fully funded those five items across the board for both the state colleges and the University. When we got down to improvement money the only money that went to the University, that was distributed between all of the campuses, a little over \$1,400,000, that \$1,400,000 is not General Fund money, it was cash funds that the systems had over and above what was expended last year. That million four came as a result of a committee amendment to 522 that the Legislature has already passed. Senator Lewis is correct that of that \$1.4 million of cash funds, distributed between the campuses, approximately \$500,000 of it did go to the Institute of Agriculture. It is true that the committee, in terms of General Funds, is about \$46,000, as of now, over the Governor's recommendation. I don't think that we can add this dollar amount to the total appropriation without probably resulting in the necessity of a triggering of the tax rates. But there is an exception. That exception is that obviously there are subsequent bills, capital construction, other areas, that we can cut in order to stay within the amount of available revenue. I understand that the allocation of limited resources on the part of the Appropriations Committee can be done differently. But I think we make an error if we start to add additional appropriations without making a like reduction somewhere in order to stay within the available amount. Without making it an issue I should have pointed this out before we started all