

would have meant reducing some programs, which ones I don't know.

SPEAKER NICHOL: The call is raised.

SENATOR WARNER: I agree that this is a straightforward issue now of an increase in these two programs of approximately 300,000, and if you feel that this increase is appropriate, then the amendment is proper to vote for. Obviously, it puts us in some more of a difficult financing problem because it would be 600,000 more than what is currently proposed.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Hefner please.

SENATOR HEFNER: Question.

SPEAKER NICHOL: The question is called, do I see five hands? I do. The question is, shall debate cease? All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record, Mr. Clerk, please.

CLERK: 26 ayes, 0 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Debate has ceased. Senator Lynch or Senator DeCamp, which one of you is going to close?

SENATOR DECAMP: Mr. President, I think Senator Warner explained it about as good as anything. This is a straightforward approach to put these people where I believe they would have been had 280A not come in and had we not relied on 280A as the funding mechanism, okay. They would have gone through the normal appropriations process. They can say they would or wouldn't have gotten the money but they would have gotten something and this is considerably less than 280A. It is a modest amount, quite frankly. Somebody said to me, well, this will be vetoed. Very good chance, very good chance, or it might even be struck at a later date if you put it on, but it puts them on a level playing field as to where they would have been had all these other things, I will even say had not the other events occurred, I won't use the word I was going to use, it just gives them a level playing field, and if they survive, fine. If not, fine, but at least put it on and put them in the position they would have been, kind of as a judicial equity, I would say. Get them where they would have been had all