

Crime Commission by almost 50 percent, then I think it is very evident that we are going to have to reduce some responsibilities. You can't haul a two-ton load on a half-ton pickup. It's that simple. I agree with Senator Chambers and other members here today that it is easy to talk in terms of law enforcement but it is tough to put the money in there when you need it. I don't think the Governor can be characterized as a wild-eyed spender. I think, and I am afraid almost, that when those budgets get over to the Governor's office we are going to see some of that meat axe approach which may be necessary, but he is going to have some ideas of his own. I don't think it is necessary, for example, that we all agree a hundred percent on these issues. There are going to be times when some of us agree and some of us disagree. And I think that those times when we do find that there is reasonable evidence to support the request that has been made by the Governor, that we ought to try to support that agency to that extent. One more point with reference to Senator Fowler's regard, I really don't feel that an agency which has been frugal in the area of expenditure of state funds in the past should at this time necessarily be penalized because they find those funds nonexistent. With reference to my own area, I want to say this, I have a firm commitment to meeting state responsibilities with state funds. I have done that many times. I prefer the route of the state taking that responsibility of appropriating the money and administering the funds. I think that is much preferable to the route that we take when we send income tax money back to the federal government, the federal government takes their cut out of it and sends a teaspoonful of it back to the states. I think it is a far more efficient method to handle it directly than to handle it indirectly. And just to add a bit of levity here, I know you will take it in the manner which I offer it, I suggested to Senator Warner that since the Appropriations Committee seems to be pretty much united on these issues and 9 people usually vote against these additions, that in all fairness 21 votes out of the remaining 40 ought to be sufficient to adopt the amendment. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, if you are going to go that way or not, but I just thought I would throw it out here. I do ask you to support the amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion is the adoption of the Schmit amendment. All those in favor of that motion vote aye, opposed vote no. Have you all voted? We are voting on the Schmit amendment to LB 559. Have you all voted? Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President, let's have a roll call vote and a Call of the House, I guess, real quickly.