

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, if you will open the red books that you have provided to you by the Budget Committee to page 49, under Agency 47, you will find exactly what the proposed amendment does. The proposed amendment provides that we do not spend approximately \$400,000 for some new equipment. It also provides that we strike \$35,000 of additional support for postsecondary instructional television programming. It strikes \$100,000 from the initial production phase of the Nebraska Heritage Series, and it strikes the \$55,000, our state's pro rata share of the national interconnection system for either public television or ETV, whichever way you want to call it. The reason for this amendment is as I have pointed out several times already on this floor, I think that it is inconsistent with the situation which faces us today to expand by more than \$700,000 the amount of money recommended by the Governor for one agency when at the same time we are cutting the budget for various agencies and those agencies which are being cut are the ones which produce the income for the State of Nebraska. It really does not make any difference to me, if it is necessary that we cut, let's all cut across the board. I am not in favor of a state three percent, or five percent or seven percent increase or decrease. I have never supported that idea, but I do believe that it is consistent with good public spending to review the budget closely and to try to place upon each individual expenditure a priority position. As desirable as educational T.V. may be or is, as much as all of us like to see ourselves on Channel 12 in the evenings, nonetheless, I think it is consistent that we review this agency, this expenditure, and try to justify whether or not we can spend that kind of money. Several days ago, after much discussion and a great deal of publicity upon the urgency of enacting legislation relative to water, this body chose not to expand the funding for the water development fund, notwithstanding the fact that there are those members of the body here who in good conscience and in good faith would like to see an individual commitment to soil conservation many times greater than it is. I would just like to say this that all of us can give an eloquent speech for anyone of these individual agencies and point out the very urgent need that the agencies face, and I could do that for educational T.V., but I think that if we are going to be consistent, I think the Budget Committee needs to answer some questions as to why this agency took a substantial increase when others were substantially reduced. I would like to ask Senator Warner a question, if he would yield, please. Senator Warner, will you tell me in as few words as possible the real reason