

to fund this. I'd urge that you would reject this amendment. If you want to assure Curtis to remain, then add \$245,000.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Schmit, please.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, again, I want to say from the outset that I am not as thoroughly informed of the impact of the Vickers amendment as is Senator Warner, but I would say that the general consensus would be that unless this Legislature does give some legislative intent that the university will do that which they deem to be best in their own judgment and it may or may not be to support Curtis to the degree and the extent that Senator Vickers thinks is necessary. The same principle applies here that applied to the previous motion by Senator Chambers. Those entities which are the most powerful, in plain language, will always be the best protected. Those which are not will be lopped off and whether or not that is in the best interest of the university, whether or not that is in the best interest of the citizens of this state is something which I don't think has been answered. I can point out and I have just pointed out several things that have happened the last week which indicate that I believe it is important that this Legislature allow agencies and entities to know how we feel about cost cutting. There are some very responsible actions that need to be taken and it is going to have some impact. Yes, we know that, but I can tell you very frankly that you can cut 10 percent out of the state budget and there will be areas that will suffer no adverse impact and there will be some that will be wiped out. I would suggest that Senator Vickers and his Curtis proposal is one which is going to probably not get much support because it is a long ways from here to Curtis and a lot of us have never been there. A lot of us couldn't find it if we had to and a lot of us will never go, but I would suggest that it's very important to that part of the state and it is one of the best operations the university has in its operation and I would not like to see it reduced further. I would suggest perhaps Senator Warner's idea is not a bad one, but you and I both know that the opportunity to put that money in there is not going to be there because we will not take those cuts that are necessary in those areas where we can't afford them. I do not want to get on this floor and begin to list some of the extravagances that I have listed, but I will do it if I have to and they are