

urge that you turn this down. The basis for a tax rate is to preserve existing services because of declining receipts, but as we add funds to take on new programs, obviously then the emphasis will appear, the perception will appear that it was for additional spending rather than trying to maintain, only maintain, those programs that we have left. So I would urge that despite the merit of the program that you not adopt the amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator Barrett. Senators Vickers, Miller, and Scofield are next in speaking order.

SENATOR BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. President and members. I reluctantly, as I did yesterday, rise to oppose the motion to authorize another \$150,000 for this very worthwhile program, and it is worthwhile, as I suggested yesterday. The budget hearing conducted by the Business and Labor Committee and the Agriculture Committee found no problem with the program. The problem is dollars as it was yesterday. My point in rising today, Mr. President, is simply to suggest to the body something that I failed to do yesterday, and that is to remind you that there will be a resolution coming within the next day or two regarding this very program. It has occurred to me that there are some federal dollars that could perhaps be reallocated from other states, dollars which are not being utilized by other states, to Nebraska and the purpose of the resolution will be to request the federal government through the U.S. Department of Labor, back to the Nebraska Department of Labor to reallocate funds for the Agriculture in Transition Program to be used by Nebraska and Nebraskans for this very, very good program, and it is. So if this amendment is not adopted for another \$150,000, as I suggested yesterday, our Ag in Transition Program, albeit excellent, is not being scuttled. We are not savaging this program and I would simply urge...with that urge the body to defeat the amendment. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Senator Vickers.

SENATOR VICKERS: Well, Mr. President, members, I rise to support the amendment. I believe the logic laid out by Senator Barrett is somewhat flawed in that, first of all, we are buying a pig in a poke if we believe we are not going to scuttle the program based on the fact that some resolution asking the federal government to reassign money is actually going to work. I have some real questions as to whether or not the federal government, with all of the budgetary problems that they have as