

September 28, 1992 LB 11

those cuts that were not made in DPI and the State Patrol because it does help cities and counties statewide. It is not going to have any of our...it will not allow any of our mentally ill to be on the streets if we were to cut DPI's budget. Our veterans are going to continue to be taken care of. Our regional centers are going to continue to be open. And, certainly, this has got to benefit the cities and villages across the state that may have to contend with increased homeless if we were to take that cut. So it seems to me that this is not a bad trade-off, that we left the money in for DPI and it's going to help cities and villages in that way in terms of having access to State Patrol and having access to DPI services. Those will continue. And if we were to have taken those cuts in that area, cities and villages would have been one of the first to have felt the impact of those cuts because their facilities and their resources would have been tapped in order to make up for the lack of DPI facilities. So, for that rationale alone, I feel comfortable in taking this cut, in addition to the fact that cities and villages have access to a mill levy. Maybe they're up against their limit, I admit that, in terms of the budget percent. But it isn't that their total resources are taken away and, as we found in some of the uses of that, even though it was entirely legitimate and legal, it was, admittedly, some would have done some of the extra things that would not have been done otherwise. And I would submit to you that the state is at the point that we can't do some of the things that would be nice, even though they...and they're not necessary, they...and it would be nice, we can't do those. And so I think it's important that we recognize that this is an absolute necessity to start cutting back. And I would submit that this will be one of the less painful cuts that we'll take come spring. In addition to that, I think it's fairly important to take it now if we possibly can, to allow those cities and villages ample time to plan into their next budget year of July 1st. Chances are we will be here at least in the vicinity of June 1st next year. If this was to be considered, that would be an unknown clear up until that time and perhaps later into June. Why not make the decision now so that they can plan for it, give them ample time to adjust. I think it would simply be more logical all the way around to approach it in this manner. So I would urge your support for this bill. It's not totally what they're getting. It simply cuts it a third and maybe that's simple...simple is too light a word, in many cases, but I submit that it's a very reasonable thing to do at this stage in the state's budget history.