

receipts, you are building at least \$10 million of cost into the budget with one-time money which won't be here next time either. So you have got to add that on top. I appreciate that it is always difficult to look at next year's budget problems now when, in fact, that is exactly what we are doing. We are either creating them for next year or we are avoiding them, and you are not going to avoid them by continuing building in obligations for '87-88 with no source of funding. And realistically, unfortunately, but realistically, and I will repeat it again, if we come out of this session with the minimum reserves, if we come out of this session with built-in obligations on the revenue side because of one-time money, then you are going to continue the problem. The only solution is going to be, unfortunately, a tax rate adjustment and that you are going to have to accept, because the alternative is tremendous deterioration of program or a massive program elimination, which is going to be counter to all the other things that this session wants to talk about doing in the way of bringing the economy back on line. So I urge that you reject this amendment, and while it may be argued that it is a 5.4 million reduction in this year's budget, it is also a 5.4 million obligation into next year's, and on top of everything else, you are merely pushing ahead your problems that ought to be resolved today.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Hefner, please on the DeCamp amendment. Senator Hefner, before you start, if I may, please, we have visiting us today in the north balcony 26 seniors from Deshler High School, guests of Senator Eret, and their teacher. We welcome you to the Unicameral. If you will rise, we will give you a hearty welcome. Hope you have a nice day. Thank you, Senator Hefner. Now on the DeCamp amendment please.

SENATOR HEFNER: Mr. President and members of the body, I rise to support the DeCamp amendment. I believe that now in these difficult economic times, especially in the rural areas, that we should be a little prudent in raising the state employees salaries. I also realize that there is good reason to raise them, but when I talked to some of the state employees in my area, they say that they would rather be able to keep their job rather than have some of them lose it because we are increasing the salaries. If we analyze Senator DeCamp's proposal, we delay the increase of 3 percent until January 1 or towards the middle of the fiscal year. I guess if this doesn't go, I was wondering if the body would support maybe a 1 1/2 or a 2 percent increase. It looks like our receipts are going to be down again from