

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR RASMUSSEN: ...that people are more likely to be involved in working productive situations if we do the best by them in those first five years. We've talked an awful lot about budget and tax situations in this session. We're trying to figure out what's the long-term solution to coming up with the tax money that we need to support the programs of the state. Here is the long-term solution and that's investing early in children's lives. We know it makes a significant difference. I urge you to reconsider the Governor's veto on this particular program. We promised it and we know it will make a significant difference.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Rasmussen. Senator Moore, followed by Senators Rasmussen, Lynch and Withem. Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Well, as Senator Withem requested, I will talk briefly on a nonpartisan fashion was the word Senator Withem used on the federal...replacement of federal funds and basically that is just what it reads there is the federal funds are declining in the voc ed department. That \$135,000 was strictly a maintenance...to maintain present services. That \$135,000 is indeed, the veto is sustained. That would certainly potentially actually result in a decline in service out in the school districts. So that's what that money is and it...if you veto it, there will be actually a decrease in the services out there and that's what the committee originally recommended. As far as the childhood ed pilot programs, the only thing I would mention, this is a lesson that's probably too late for this session but it was one of those bills last year that the costs grew in the out year. Remember when we passed this bill last year there was only an \$80,000 A bill fiscal impact in the first year of the bill, those A bills were all two-year bills but, obviously, it transcended the biennium. In the second year, the A bill for the '91-92 year there was a \$400,000 cost. That's one of those things that people tend to look only at the year in which we were voting on bills and it's one of those bills that if you look in the next year, particularly in the case of last year, the next biennium that cost increased somewhat dramatically. And that's neither here nor there. That's just the way it is and I think there's a variety of other bills that we've already passed that are like that where the cost is not...is somewhat marginal, somewhat close to marginal the first year and then