

the discussion the other day on this round of appropriations. I do want to call your attention to the constitutional provision relative to the Governor's ability to veto appropriations which reads he has the ability to veto in excess of his recommendation. I have spoken to the Speaker suggesting that perhaps we better get a clarification from the Attorney General, certainly before any vetos are considered, if there are some, as to whether or not that language is to the total dollar amount of appropriations, total level, or if it is on an agency-by-agency basis. In any event, if you're talking about a veto, and I think the Governor's position is clear as to what level he would approve, each time you add you may well be taking something out, unknownst to you at this point, somewhere else in the appropriations. I think you want to consider carefully, as you add, that the odds may well be that you're also subtracting, but not at your decision, where that cut is going to occur. Again, I suggest that, but not using that argument on this particular issue, it is one I think we should all keep in mind throughout the afternoon. Again I would urge that the body not adopt the amendment. I think if this is adopted it would probably trigger even more, unless you're going to be willing to virtually abolish all capital construction, as far as higher education is concerned to take up the total increase in dollars that probably would be added before the afternoon was over.

CLERK: Mr. President, a motion on the desk.

SENATOR MARVEL: Read the motion.

CLERK: Read Schmit amendment found on page 2006 of the Journal.

SENATOR MARVEL: Chair recognizes Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President, members of the Legislature. I've been accused, from time to time, of steamrolling things in this Legislature. Now I can feel the steamroller coming right after my neck, along with Senator Kremer. I agree with Senator Warner that we've got to have priorities. I agree with my good friend, Senator Lewis, that in some areas we have been treated very well. I even agree with Senator Dave Newell once in awhile. But I'd like to suggest to you that I had prepared amendments that would have reduced the budget sufficiently to have allowed for the introduction of these amendments without any increase in expenditures. I offered one here yesterday that would have saved \$120,000 that would not have, in my opinion, hurt the state one bit. But that amendment was rejected. I had some other amendments. I notice that in the area of excellence...and I'm going to cite these areas now because I've agreed to withdraw all the amendments. It was agreed that the School of Architecture needs some additional money. I prepared an amendment that would have saved about \$80,000 there, that was over the Regents request that was appropriated by the Appropriations Committee. It was pointed out to me very carefully and eloquently by some members here how drastically it would effect the School of Architecture if that amendment were allowed to be passed into law. There was another amendment that effected the School of Music, saved another \$60 or \$80 thousand. It was explained to me in the same persistent manner that if this amendment were adopted the School of Music would make no more music. I had another amendment that was prepared for the College of Law that would have saved \$175,000. But I was convinced, after being lobbied by attorneys, and friends of attorneys, and professors at the College of Law that if we should, by some fluke, pass that