

comes up all the time whether or not it's even appropriate for state funding to look at advocacy for a particular population, be it the Mexican-American Commission, the Status on Women, and developmental disabilities, what is the role, you know, and we have done some funding when it comes to advocacy groups and I've been supportive. I was...I think I was the one that brought up the motion a couple of years ago on a budget bill in Appropriations Committee to expand Omaha from Lincoln. I know that in their plans they have looked at North Platte. The next one would be Scottsbluff. Many of the things that this agency does, I think, has been very helpful in matching adults and people with...also with clients that have developmental disabilities, helping them find jobs, helping them find a place to live. I think...I think that's all very good in what they do. I do have some problems with the fact that they filed court cases on behalf of developmental disabil...disabled people in the courts against the State of Nebraska. I do not know particularly if that's the role of advocacy agencies and I think that's a question we need to ask ourself, whether or not they're stepping outside of the realm of what their role and mission is in advocacy. I, in this case, I feel that if they have that kind of time, that kind of staffing, they could again prioritize and look at setting up another office to be able to help individuals versus looking at spending their time and efforts on bringing lawsuits against the State of Nebraska. The other thing that I would like to add here when we're talking about adding programs and monies to carry out programs, I'd like to point out about two years ago, on Appropriations Committee on a deficit funding, when the federal match came down on Medicaid to DSS that was lower than what we thought it was going to be, than what we had planned, DSS came up short 5.7 million dollars. That's 5.7 million dollars and we said to DSS prioritize, eat it. They did. They did not come back for a deficit. There were those of us on the Appropriations Committee that would have put money on the table, said they'll be back for a deficit. They didn't. My point is agencies have to learn to prioritize somewhat. Agencies now and then may have to do something where they have to tighten their belts a little bit, that every time there's a new program, every time there's an expansion they may have to learn how to internally manage some things to do this and a good example again that I would give is DSS who took a 5.7 million dollar hit and they managed to do it. But was that healthy for the agency? Did we get all the services we need? Maybe not, but there's a time when prioritizing your services in what you're going to have to do, I think, comes about. They