

September 28, 1992 LB 11

and you remember there was a statement in LB 1059 saying that we ought to fund school...aid to education in the State of Nebraska to the tune of 45 percent. That's what the original intent was in 1990. Also, we increased state budgets in state agencies across the board rather significantly in the late eighties. When you look at all those items I just mentioned, since their passage this body has revisited them because of financial need to do so. LB 89 was \$20 million. We passed LB 91 at \$15 million. Now that bill is at \$7 million. Why? Because there wasn't the money to sustain it at \$20 million. LB 1059, we passed that with the hope of funding schools 45 percent from the state. Now we're talking about 41 percent from the state. Why? On that one, probably partially because school districts' costs increased more than we thought but also because there is not the money there to sustain that. State agencies, we increased them significantly and the eighties and nineties, shall we say, addressing some pent-up needs through the across-the-board reductions in the base last biennium as well as the 1.5 percent reduction in the base we're talking about, here today we're addressing that problem. When you talk about the actual infrastructure of the State of Nebraska, we have infrastructure problems in the State of Nebraska. When this body passed the MIRF bill in 1989, the appropri...the annual appropriation this body made to our state's own infrastructure problems in our own buildings was a 5.5 million annually appropriation to LB 309. Since that time, it is now down to \$2 million. It's things like that, commitments this body made when times were good we've had to revisit a variety of those. One we have yet to revisit is MIRF. And I am not here in any way, shape or form to criticize how that money is being spent. I, myself, and the Appropriations Committee and then maybe other members of the committee can talk about some concerns over reporting requirements and how the money is spent. But the main thrust of the argument I'm going to make right now is that we have looked at practically every other spending decision we made in the late eighties and early nineties and we've cut back because of economic need to do so. One that we have not done is in MIRF. And, as you are well aware of, as this body is well aware of, last year when we had base reductions in the state agencies, when we had reductions in HELP, when we fell short of our hopes in 1059, one thing we left untouched was state aid to localities, state aid to cities, that was left untouched. I guess my simple observation is the time has come when we have to look at MIRF as well as all the other things we have already reduced. Not that this particular money does not go to a