

admitted, on our discussion on General File that, no, this does not save money, that their purpose is not to save money, it's just to realign the agencies, to make them more efficient. Which is a good purpose and in concept may work. Although with the adoption of the thirty positions, I really don't see how that can function in the manner that you say. So you say one thing, and yet you're adopting language that does the complete opposite. What this amendment would do is on page 4, line 17 of the green copy, it would strike "and", and show as stricken in line 20, after "Legislature", insert, "a plan to reduce operation costs as a result of combining agencies involved". What this section of the bill does is ask the directors of the agencies to work in partnership with the public and the agency employees and to develop a report that will be submitted to the Governor and the Legislature, by December 1, 1996, that's the end of this year. And it talks about what they're asking for in the plan, and the plan will be a transition plan, describing action, method, steps and time-lines necessary to implement redesign of the agencies by January 1, 1997. The plan sets outcomes desired to form the basis of accountability of health and human services at the state and community level. It supports local service networks that will foster determination of community services, et cetera, et cetera. But nowhere in the plan does it ask to look at, even look at the possibility that we could reduce operating costs as a result of this restructuring. So I am just suggesting that when these individuals who will be involved, the directors of these agencies who will be in this policy cabinet that we're... that you are adopting in 1044, because I freely admit I will not be voting for it, but you are adopting in 1044, when they put together this plan, I would simply ask that they look at the possibility, remote as it might be, that we could possibly reduce operating costs as a result of the combining of these agencies. I know that's not the intent of the individuals who put this concept together, I know pacts have been signed with unions on this one. But, as a taxpayer and a fiscal conservative, I realize that there are individuals out there, many of them signing petitions as we speak, that think, for some reason, that their tax burden is too much in the state of Nebraska and that we're spending too much money in the Legislature. I know that's a hard thing for you to grasp, but since the last amendment failed and you are not going to look at ways to actually increase service, I don't think, you can't possibly if you're putting in more management, less front-line