

the agencies, I think we really go into detail, and it might be worth your while, Senator Bromm, or anyone else, sometimes to look at the original list and the original set of proposals from the agencies that we look at...

SENATOR LINDSAY: One minute.

SENATOR CROSBY: ...to see what they say can be cut. And then, of course, they come back to the hearing and say, no, we didn't really mean that, can't be cut. So that's what you go through and that's what you're going through today. And we have to come to grips with the whole thing and we have to come around to the end and decide what we will fund and what we will not fund, what cuts we may restore, what cuts we may not restore. But I think we do look in depth. And I hope some of you, if you are interested, that you will look at my resolution and if you want to help on that interim study, be glad to have you come aboard. Thank you.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Senator Crosby. Anyone further wishing to speak on LB 330? Senator Moore, to close.

SENATOR MOORE: Just briefly in my closing, as I said in the opening on the committee amendments, I think it's once again important to understand, I mean, you keep talking about the growth in state operations and higher education, you know, in between from July 1, '89 to the end of the biennium, this biennium budget sets, I mean, the overall increase in the state operation, which is only 40 percent of the budget, 60 percent of it is something else, but in the state operation higher education component of the budget it increased \$125 million over a five-year period. Of that \$125 million, 121 of it was the negotiated salary increases and the salaries of people placed in by the Legislature. By that, I mean you take...it's all salaries there, that's where that growth is occurring. Another thing to mention, if you look at LB 330, there is only about four areas where you can argue this bill is affecting the growth in state employees or government employees at all. Obviously, if you look at the state Supreme Court, LB 330 places new field auditors in the court. That's basically to...that's basically to fund auditors in the Supreme Court that the state Auditor chose not to do. And so we said, you know, instead of having the state Auditor has refused to do that, or whatever, I don't get into that, but that's to audit county court functions, that's the one area, new field auditors, a couple of them there,