

projections, we are going to be looking at an accumulative reduction over this session and the next session of something in excess of \$40 million in order to make room for expansion of programs that are already authorized by statute, are essential entitlements, and to provide the funding for the ongoing programs other than that. But with that gap that's going to be there, if it's spread over again over a couple years, it probably is more easily handled than trying to do it all at one time. The reductions that the committee is proposing, I don't know how much you want me to...I can just mention them briefly, I guess. There was a couple, three things that we did differently from the way the Governor's proposal came in. One of the things we did in three aid programs, Mental Retardation and Mental Health and Alcohol Aid, rather than the half of a veto that had been given by the Governor, we used a similar approach as to other agencies in which we made the reduction 1 1/2 percent of the total appropriation that the agency would receive. Now, in every instance that somewhat...or significantly in some cases reduced the total proposed reduction but, nevertheless, that seemed the more equitable way to do it than just half of the amount of the veto. In the MAT buses, the sheet shows 400,000. Actually there is no reduction in the MAT buses. It is for cash flow purposes. It spread 400,000 for the current year, '86-87, and 400,000 of appropriation then would show in the '87-88 fiscal year. The reason that we felt we should do this, at least give some assistance this year while there is no overall impact, is that the federal grant in which these funds are to be used has been approved and they would be able to go ahead and take their bids and get those buses ordered but it was probably in the vicinity of a six-months time frame before they would be delivered, but at that point the money would be available even though it was appropriated in two different fiscal years. The committee amendment does retain the current \$100,000 for the Scottsbluff nursing program and the reduction that would have affected the University of Nebraska was reduced by that amount. In the case of the advocacy commissions, I should indicate to you that we took no action. That is not to be interpreted that we endorsed the Governor's veto as a committee, or that we did not, but rather that we took no action. I would assume that those of you who want to retain the advocacy commissions will have motions to strike those sections totally from the bill, because if that is done, why then you, of course, those commissions would not be again before the Governor for veto if he chose to do so because they would not even be in the bill. I assume if we would have done anything other than endorse the Governor's advocacy commission,