

strong case. I know that rural senators feel the need to continue to go down the line and support the vet school because a number of agricultural groups look upon the vet school as a symbol of their lobbying success, but the vet school will not put food on the farmers' table or money in the farmers' bank account. The vet school will, however, take money from our expenditures. The vet school can cause us in the end to have to increase the tax rates. I am of the opinion that we need very much to establish our own set of spending priorities, to spend for those items that are the most dear to the well-being of the citizens of our state, and with respect to those items that are less dear to the well-being of the citizens of our state to not spend for those. So I say if we want not to increase the tax rates we must begin slowly, inexorably pruning back our budget and this is the first item that I think we should simply cut out. Now I want you to know there are some items that I hold very dear, but I have acceded to their being cut from the budget because I am committed in my mind not to increase our tax rates. I have fought very vigorously to provide ADC benefits to the neediest folk in society, but I have acceded to a decision by the Appropriations Committee and by others to reduce the level of ADC benefits to unborn children because I have felt that such reduction could be made without devastation upon that impoverished category of our society and I have done it because I have felt in the end that we must make priority spending decisions. I would ask that the same be done for the planning money for the vet school. It's an important spending priority decision. I think it's significant that we show the people of this state, the Board of Regents, county government, local school boards, that we are capable and have the will to prune those things that no longer are as strong as they once were. I support Senator Vickers' amendment.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Warner, please.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, this particular item when it was discussed at the Appropriations Committee, essentially, I think, the conclusion of the committee was that rather than take out these funds at this point that the issue ought to be dealt with on LB 204 which was before the Legislature and, therefore, we did not place on our recommendation list the removal of this authorization and...because of the belief that it could be handled, as I said, in LB 204.