

September 30, 1992 LB 11

you're going to have to, you know, right now, probably have to cut \$30 million to make things balance, 30 million somewhere. We'll revisit MIREF again, we'll revisit all sorts of things, revisit Senator Hall's tax side of things, we'll have to do that next year. But the difference between MIREF and a lot of other things we postponed this session is we don't know enough about them. We don't know enough about wards of the court, we don't know enough about the Medicaid statute changes, we don't know enough...well, we know enough about ADC, we decided what we...

SENATOR CONWAY: One minute.

SENATOR MOORE: ...were going to give on that. But the MIREF thing we know, it's a given, either you want to do it or you don't. If you don't want to do it, that's fine, but we're going to have to find the money someplace else. I don't think it's too much to ask the \$1.5 million. When you look at the big picture of state and local government and all resources involved, the \$1.5 million is not generous in any way, shape, or form. And you're already willing to give in on your promise with any amendment you're willing to vote for.

SENATOR CONWAY: Thank you, Senator Moore. Senator Landis, you're next.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature. I thought that was a very insightful and appropriate speech for Senator Moore to make. I want to give you a flip side of the coin as to why I can support the Schellpeper amendment. It is true that with any action that we've taken so far today, any of the amendments considered, there is the breach of the promise of MIREF. And I was the initial introducer of that measure, and I've been supporting all of the efforts to stop the run on the bank here on MIREF. But I have done it somewhat joyously. I'll tell you why. I agree that we are in difficult times and that we need to call across the board for lots of people to assist in contributing to making up the shortfall. And I have had a difficult time saying, well, I want king's X in my favorite program. So I think rather joyously I've made the arguments to keep that as a minimum. I will tell you that I'm now at a place that I think this is a reasonable approach in line with the amount of requests from other entities, that we've asked to draw this line, which is a total of \$9 million of cuts, that's what is in the Schellpeper amendment, \$9 million of cuts spread out over 18 years. But it