

is somewhat important and I also understand the economic situation that is going on right now, but when we examine our own business we each have to set priorities under budgetary constraints. As I mentioned the other day, we've had a lot more than a 3 percent budget cut in our business, but we still feed the old cows. We don't let them go hungry just because they are losing money. It seems to me there are ways that the University and other institutions, other agencies of government, could figure out a way to cut, be it 2 percent, 3 percent or whatever, in a way that doesn't affect the services to the individuals that they are designed to serve. At least minimize that cut, minimize the effect on those services and I think that is what the amendment offered by Senator Lamb and others...

SPEAKER NICHOL: One minute.

SENATOR VICKERS: ...is attempting to do. I think it is appropriate that this body send that message. As I indicated and as Senator Lamb has indicated it is intent language, we fully recognize that. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Wesely, please, and then Senator Withem.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members, I would rise in opposition to this amendment. I think it is an attempt and it ought to portray for you a couple of inconsistencies with some members of this body. You can't have your cake and eat it too. You can't have a situation where you oppose adequate budgets for the University and then turn around and not support some of the budget cuts that come as a consequence of having an inadequate budget. You cannot have it both ways. Senator Lamb had previously supported budget cuts last session and then turned around and opposed closing the pharmacy school, I think it was, Senator Lamb. Others did similar type things, supported budget cuts at the University and then turned around and opposed cutting down the athletic program at UN-O, or did not like to see pharmacy or nursing close. You can't have it both ways. If you support budget cuts you have to accept the consequences. I think that is clear. You can't have a situation, as Senator Vickers would hope for at some point, where you can cut and not have any resultant loss of services or programs. We don't have fat in the budget as we