

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Remmers, please, then Senator Lamb, then Senator Warner.

SENATOR REMMERS: Mr. President, Senators, I rise to oppose the suggested amendment to 722. There are programs we could cut. There is one in particular that would save a million dollars or several programs, four programs that I think we referred to as advocacy programs that I would cut, be willing to cut the full million dollars. But I don't think we can get that done. We all have ideas in some areas we would like to cut, but I think it is becoming very evident that we are not going to...not going to agree. I would like to take this opportunity to say that I thought that letters that were sent to the Appropriations Committee this morning were very inappropriate. Not that there is anything sacred about the Appropriations Committee but they had worked hard for a long time and to suggest that they go back and see if they can cut some more out I thought was completely out of line. If we want to cut some on the floor, I think that is the time to do it because the Appropriations Committee has said they have done what they can. But I think we are just spinning our wheels. There is no question there is programs that could be cut. There is no question that the University could cut some programs. I have some serious concern that maybe we are trying to be all things to all people with our University. Can we support all the graduate programs that we have in Creighton and the University of Nebraska? Population 1.5 million. Yes, I think there are programs that could be cut, but I don't think we can do it like we are trying to do it now. The cuts that we are talking about either shift in most cases, shift the tax load from one place to the other. For instance, we raise gas tax because we want roads built and now we want to take some of that money back out. We are talking about that type of a shift here or there. Some of the other shifts that we are talking about are the cuts that we are talking now, will cut hard on some programs that I think are very, very essential for human needs. And those we have cut too hard. Those shouldn't be cut. We have some special needs that are hurt by this kind of a cut and also the cuts bear heavily on a small group of people. I can't see that we should cut the state employees beyond what we have already done, why they should have to carry the load. So the cuts we are proposing in most cases are either shifting the load, tax load from one side to the other or they are bearing heavily on