

has also taken great steps towards self-sufficiency. For these reasons, I will oppose Senator DeCamp's amendment to the amendment and support the Landis amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Schmit, then Senator Vard Johnson.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, first of all, I oppose Senator DeCamp's amendment. Secondly, I think you all ought to recognize that Senator DeCamp is attempting to make a point. What Senator DeCamp has proposed to do here, with what appears to be a minuscule amount of money and with what we all know are groups which are not going to affect the election of any one of us, is going to come back to haunt us unless something happens soon to turn around the revenue earning capacity of this state. Senator DeCamp mentioned several days ago maybe we ought to close the medical school. Well, there are those who would say if you close the medical school of the State of Nebraska, you would save \$46 million and we still have a medical school in the state. In fact, you could contract, and I did a little research on this a year ago, you could contract with Creighton for probably half of what it costs us to operate the University of Nebraska Medical School. I don't want to cause repercussions from here to the banks of the Missouri, but if you want to start talking about things, let's recognize the fact that today we hear it repeatedly, we have too many doctors. Now we don't have doctors, Senator Scofield, in western Nebraska many times. You can't drag a man out there to practice if he doesn't want to, or woman. We don't have doctors in rural areas, but we do have too many doctors and yet we continue to crank out doctors at an alarming cost each year. We have two schools of dentistry, we have two schools of pharmacy, we have, as someone pointed out, Senator Scofield I think, several schools of nursing in this area of the state, so when it comes right down to it, one of these days someone is going to stand on this floor and propose that we eliminate and you can't do it. You cannot do it by wiping out the advocacy commissions. You can't do it by taking a 100,000 here and a 100,000 there. You've got to take it in millions. I read a little article by the Governor in which he supports the \$11 million increase in salaries that a 3 percent raise will entail. He says you've got to have it to attract and keep good people. He makes a very laudable point, a very viable point, but is a 3 percent raise which costs \$11 million for people who already have a job more important than \$66,000 for people where the unemployment rate runs in excess of 50 or 60 percent? I think not. I think not. Ask yourself when it comes down, do you want to take four or