

program. I think it is pretty hypocritical. I think we really need to reject this amendment and let the rest of this budget process go on. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Warner, then Senator Chronister.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I'd like to rise and support Senator Lamb's amendment because I, personally, have a belief that the school at Curtis is unique and ought to be maintained. My problem with wanting to do what my heart tells me is that I agree with those who say either we identify where all the cuts are going to be, or we say nothing. I think the better choice right now is to say nothing in order to provide that opportunity to take a more considered time. But my opposition specifically to the amendment deals more with the details of it. The closing of Curtis, as proposed, is a possibility, does not take affect until July 1 of '86, next year's fiscal year, next year's budget, the one that we will be establishing in the regular session in January, beginning in January. If you look at the cuts for LB 722, and that is what the amendment refers to, the only identified cut on this list that affects the Institute of Agriculture directly is extension agents, \$150,000, which represents 4.5 percent of the reduction that will occur with the 2 percent reduction that we adopted earlier. The Institute's General Fund budget of UN-L is almost 33 percent of the total General Fund budget. That is about \$60 million for UN-L, about \$30 million for the Institute. Now if the Institute is to be proportionate to the others, instead of a 4.5 percent I assume this reads the other way. That means one-third of the cut probably is supposed to come out of the Institute's budget. They are not proposing that for this fiscal year. They only have identified \$150,000. The others, there may be some in the freezing of positions, part-time faculty, equipment, travel, proportionately some portion of that may fall in the Institute. The other reason that I would hope might work out in supporting two percent as opposed to three, I would hope that that reduction can provide the Regents with an opportunity not to have to close a freestanding institution such as Curtis. I don't know if that can be avoided. But I would hope that was sufficient to do that. So I would urge that you not adopt the amendment. I think its practical effect would be to reduce the Institute's budget more than what they are proposing for this fiscal year. The issue of Curtis in itself, without