

Education by its very nature, the Education Committee, its very function is to consider the education in all subject matter areas whether you are talking about Journalism or Agriculture, or Business, that is Education. It is not something in one subject matter or another subject matter. It is a whole category that cuts across all subject matter. The theory here is for the initial referencing is that because the subject matter area is agriculture, that it should go to Agriculture, but follow the logic of that a minute. Does that mean if we are interested in creating a business school that it should go to Banking and Commerce, that if we are interested in creating a school of natural resources that it should go to Public Works? You can go on down the line. If we are interested in expanding the Law School, should that go to the Judiciary Committee? I hope that the ludicrousness of this type of categorization is apparent to you. The job of the Education Committee is to examine education expenditures as a whole and to make some determinations as to where the education dollar is best spent. How can the Education Committee ever hope to get a handle on that kind of decision making if each subject matter committee is going to take away the important decisions that affect the overall expenditure of the education dollar every time that important decision comes along? The bill was not incorrectly referenced to Education to begin with. It was correctly referenced and now the whole Education Committee has a year...two years' involvement of time and expenditure. The staff has involvement in time and expenditure on this very question. But now we are going to go through the process of reeducating the Agriculture Committee staff, of reeducating the members of the Agriculture Committee on this very subject. Is this not a wasteful process? Secondly, let me suggest to you that every committee here has a built-in prejudice toward its subject matter area. I don't think it is saying anything particularly novel to point out to you that everybody who is on the Agriculture Committee is very interested in the promotion of agriculture, and that is perhaps as it should be, and likewise those on Public Works are interested in solving the water problems, doing something. Those in business are interested in a strong private enterprise system and seeing that it stays strong. If you allow these subject matter areas to take over questions such as the construction of education facilities, then I suggest to you that you are not going to get as objective a view of the subject as you would if you left it in the Education Committee where they are considering expenditures in all different areas, hopefully with no built-in prejudice for one area