

on the attack, willing to do that. This is the first step certainly because if we lose some of these programs, quite frankly, we will lose some of the ability to take the initiative and I guess that is one thing that has me most concerned. I know it is probably not going to be the most popular motion offered today, but I wanted to bring these points to your attention because I was not able to address them yesterday when Senator Lamb offered his motion at that time. So I would hope that you will assist me in this endeavor. I think it is a worthwhile motion. I hope that at least 25 of you are willing to seriously consider this motion and quite possibly vote for it. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Warner, then Senator Carsten has asked for some time.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I would hope that you can separate in your mind that there are two issues. If you want to support this, it is philosophically you want to see Curtis continue. That is one thing. But keep in mind what you are doing to the bill in that process of expressing a philosophical position. Look at the amendment. It says, LB 722 of the '85 session, that is the budget year you are talking about, and if you look at what the University has indicated it will do, short term, it is not even mentioned, Curtis. All that is mentioned that deals directly with agriculture, and even that is not totally agriculture, is 150,000, extension agents. Not mentioned. Where the institute did identify the School of Technical Agriculture at Curtis is for the '86-87 fiscal year. The issue of Curtis will be before the Legislature if it shows up as a modification to be funded when we meet in '86. You are not...that issue can come up no matter what you do because all we are effecting is this year's appropriation for which there is no proposed elimination of Curtis. It is '86-87. That is significant. Secondly, I have a concern because once we start down the route of what they shall not do, the list of shall-nots will grow quickly and easily and I think it is much better to be able to handle the issues of what is going to be eliminated come July 1 of '86. When we are in session in '86 it will be specific, the Regents will have acted and then we can deal with a known situation, not what is at this point a proposed budget modification for '86-87. Now what have we done that might relieve the pressure to eliminate the