

the economic condition in rural Nebraska which had fallen with a vengeance on the urban areas much sooner than it did on rural Nebraska because I was talking about it when I came down here 16 years ago and it's just now hitting the rural areas, but the issue is this. Are we going to look at these programs only in terms of cutting money or are we going to look at the value of the program and make a judgment on that basis? If it's just money, then this program has to go when the wagon comes. If it's on merit, then each program is going to have to be evaluated and analyzed and retained on the basis of its value. Just like when we were talking about the farm situation, whether the farm is a business or a way of life, and I don't think that issue was settled there, but we do have a chance to settle this one because this bill offers many opportunities for discussion and amendment. So, Senator Nichol, if I may, can I make clear what we are doing on this? I'm not offering an amendment. What I'm doing is suggesting that we reject the committee's amendment. That is what I am doing, so what you'll be doing when time comes to vote, if you want to leave that cut in is to vote against the committee amendment and I'll cover that again in my close, but people keep saying my amendment, but I don't have an amendment up there that I am offering.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator DeCamp, and then Senator Haberman.

SENATOR DECAMP: Mr. President and members, I'd like to put geography aside for a moment, personalities, and I'm trying to look at the various programs using two simple standards. One, is it actually elimination of a program or simply starvation of a program? In other words, are you actually by your action here today or tomorrow or whenever, are you actually taking something out of existence that was in existence and, therefore, does it go over into the future? Have you eliminated expenditures for '87, for '88, for '89 and '90? That's the first question I'm trying to put as a test to everything here. And the second question that I'm trying to put and I think is reasonable, the second question is, does the action you take simply shift the money over to property tax or somewhere else? In other words, are you eliminating an expenditure or are you just shifting it? Now if I look at this program, unfortunately, forgetting geography, forgetting personalities, this program is a little bit like...well, quite frankly, it's a little bit like my Atkinson Dam. This is a completely new program that is not yet in existence and you are eliminating it, not starving it. If you allow it to exist, just like the small dog or the small calf, it's going to eat a lot more food in ensuing years. It's