

that because of past government action they have a moral obligation to do it. We want them to do it whatever the situation is. It is that critical. It is that critical to our welfare. If you adopt Senator Lamb's amendment and drop this language after the Legislature has been offered this language, then what you're saying to the federal government is that we don't want any bail out unless the federal government has a legal obligation to do it and I represent to you right now on this floor that they do not have a legal obligation to do it. We have looked at the statutes. We have called Zorinsky's office, we have called Exon's office. Everybody we've talked to comes back with the same answer. There is no federal government legal liability to bail out this system. So if you drop this language and imply to the federal government that the only situation in which we want assistance or in which we feel assistance is appropriate is a situation where there is a legal obligation, that is tantamount to telling the federal government we don't want any help. And if that is what you want to say, you can say it, but that's what you're saying if you adopt the Lamb amendment.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Vickers, then Senator Harris.

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. President and members, I, too, rise to oppose Senator Lamb's amendment and largely on many of the same points that Senator Beutler has just elaborated on, but let me elaborate just a little bit further on the moral obligation part. As Senator Beutler has indicated there probably is no legal obligation. There are a lot of things that we as elected officials make decisions on that we probably, if we would turn strictly to our statutes to try to determine whether or not we had a legal obligation, we would not do. But as elected officials representing the people of this government, it seems to me that it would be a travesty if we ignored the fact that this government is made up of those people. And since it is made up of those people, then it's obvious to me that the government has got some moral obligations to them. It seems to me that if we give the out to the federal government to say that they really don't have any obligation, legally or morally, to let the mid-Western region collapse, then we might as well pack up our bags and go home and I'll tell you quite frankly, I'm not going to have any home to go home to and I wouldn't want to. If our government can totally ignore what happens in the whole agricultural sector, then we might as well figure