

program? By going from three to two, at least you have lessened the pressure for the need to the University and the state colleges, for that matter, to identify programs for elimination. The deeper the cut, the more the necessity. Secondly, I want to talk about the Institute of Agriculture because it is significant, different. We have a line-item appropriation for the Institute of Agriculture. It is included in the amount that goes to UN-L but the subsection says there that it keeps them separate. So the effect for the Vice-Chancellor of the Institute of Agriculture when cuts are made within that campus it has to be within their appropriation. Roy Arnold's choice which the Regents eventually would have to approve or disapprove is to work within what does he do to reduce the scope within the Institute of Agriculture. The Regents' choice is what do they do within the appropriation of the Institute of Agriculture if any reduction is to be made. As I indicated yesterday, when you are looking at higher education and we talk about reducing the scope...

PRESIDENT: One minute.

SENATOR WARNER: ...you have to because there is no other way you start to look at the free-standing elements of that institution. Curtis is free-standing. They cannot go in and abolish the department of agronomy or the department of animals. I guess it's not called agronomy anymore, Animal Husbandry, Entomology, any of those, because they are all support programs for a general agricultural program. And I would hope that you keep in mind that if you adopt this amendment, number one, you probably are going to generate a whole lot of other what-not-to-dos. But, more importantly, the place to deal with it will be in the '86-87 budget because Curtis does not close during this fiscal year. It's not proposed to be. It will not be. True, if the budget that the University proposes in their modifications and it will be dealt with in January that that is a possibility, it can't happen if you appropriate a million three to Curtis specifically at that time beginning July 1, '86. That's where you make the decision. I would hope that we would not start the route of a list of what-nots because there is no place to stop and the purpose for which the amendment is being offered is at the moment not in jeopardy, so I would hope you would not adopt the amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator Carsten.