

the Education Committee that heard the bill that originally resulted in the law that we have on the books today. I voted against it in committee. I voted against it on the floor as I have voted against the Vet College each and every time it has come before the Legislature while I have been here and I will tell you why. During that conversation, during that hearing, we took testimony from proponents of the Vet College, among them those who compared our existing method of paying the tuition for Nebraska students elsewhere and those Nebraska students who will be coming to a vet college that might be created under the auspices of LB 245. There are currently ninety-eight students that go elsewhere in the state that are Nebraska students. There will be roughly one hundred and forty Nebraska students at the Vet College here. However, since it is a four year school, that means that there are ten students in each of the four classes so that in any one year we have ten Nebraska graduates under 245 that we would not have in any other circumstance, you know, with our normal appropriation of money to tuitions. Of those ten, however, statistics tell us that five will not return to their home state so that we are down now to five veterinarians produced each year by this thirty million dollar appropriation and of the veterinarians across the nation that hearing indicated clearly that small animal practice, pet animal practice is roughly fifty to sixty percent of the occupations that veterinarians go into. So of the five remaining veterinarians that we'd have in that year, three we can expect will go into pet animal practice and have nothing whatever to do with the livestock industry. What do we have with LB 245 and with a new vet college? We have a thirty million dollar expenditure. We have a continuing obligation of at least a million and probably quite a bit more than that each year, and what do we get? Two large animal practice veterinarians each year and that is what our bonus is to this state. Now I have read those figures about all of the multiplier effects, all of the research capabilities, but this idea is sold because of some believed or perceived or alleged veterinary...the lack of veterinarians across the state which has yet to be proved and be documented, and, secondly, the mechanism that we are spending all this money for is going to release to us to solve that problem two veterinarians a year. Oftentimes they do analyses at the end of the year about presents and not voting, excused and not voting, you know those tabulations. I have always believed that we should add one more to that list and it should be present and voting dumb and it seems to me that when you spend thirty million dollars, when you have a continuing obligation of one, two or three million dollars a year, and what you get is two veterinarians, you're present and voting dumb. I am going to support