

think they could be cut in half from a 3 percent increase to 1.5 percent increase. I have that proposal. I had understood originally the Governor was going to support the very two things I have mentioned. I can't find any evidence at this point that anybody is supporting those things. So as I say, I think those cuts that have 25 votes have been made and that now if you want to cut another \$20 million, you have to come up with something else. The one thing that has traditionally worked when we absolutely had an emergency, the one thing that Exxon or Thone or just about anybody, from what I can recall, had to resort to were across the board cuts. Treat everybody the same and reduce the entire budget or, practically speaking, the entire budget by a certain amount. In this case I'm handing out material now, both of you, that will reflect as follows: A 3 percent cut will get you your other \$20 million, in fact, \$21 million. Now when we use the word "across the board cuts" I want to make something very clear. It doesn't apply to everything. For example, I'm handing out two sheets and I want you to look at it quickly if you would. It says, across the board cuts. It does not apply to legislative salaries, that's a fixed amount; constitutional officers' salaries; miscellaneous claims, these are fixed amounts, as you know; civil action claims, and I am not applying it to capital construction. Why? Because traditionally these are the areas where both the Exxon and Thone administration and others found you don't cut. I'm also not applying it to the following: The School for the Deaf, the School for the Visually Handicapped, Mentally Retarded and Blind Rehabilitation, Mental Health, Beatrice State Center, Nebraska Veterans Homes. Finally, the employees' retirement, it's not applied to them, not applied to state claims. Why? These are services being provided to the people and it's felt, at least in the past, that cuts in these areas actually didn't work very good. So, the total budget amount that the claims, or the cut I should say, the cut is being made against, if you were to adopt it, would be on the basis of a \$701 million budget, \$703 million. That's the second sheet you've got. Why that budget? Because you've taken about \$10 million out now. Originally, I was dealing with a \$708 million budget. Now it is down to about a 703 or whatever, \$701 million budget. So it's 3 percent of a \$700 million budget in simple terms, \$21 million. Is it wise? I don't know. Is it wise to make another \$20 million in cuts? I think that's the question you have to answer. If you judge it to be wise to make that