than taking it strictly from Beatrice and from Region 4. I guess that is the direction we are going here so I would urge you to reject this amendment, but if you do, then have another amendment to reinstate those funds you took from those other places.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Newell. Your light is on, do you want to talk? Yes, there are. Senator Hefner. There has only been one talking on the subject and I don't think that is fair.

SENATOR HEFNER: Mr. President, members of the body, I rise to oppose bringing this bill back to add this amendment. I feel that we debated it long and hard the other day and again today and I feel that we should not reconsider this motion. I feel that we need to leave $500,000 in the Beatrice fund. We need it so that we can move patients out of there as the court has ordered us to do. We need it to add or to help those that are on the waiting list. We also need it to help the mentally retarded. I feel that if some of the regions do need more money, why then we should go back and appropriate more money for this reason. Therefore, I would oppose bringing this bill back for this particular amendment at this time.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Fenger. Senator Remmers. Senator Fenger, do you want to talk?

SENATOR FENGER: A question of Senator Warner, I guess, if he would yield please.

SENATOR CLARK: All right.

SENATOR FENGER: Senator Warner, last summer the members of the Public Health and Welfare Committee spent a half a day at Beatrice and we were exposed to what is known as the Thone Three Plan, the federal court's jurisdiction and authority to remove people, inmates, to less restrictive surroundings and that, it is my understanding, they had some control over the amount of money spent at the development center. I guess my question to you is is there anything in the Thone Three Plan mandate that would be violated by this transfer of funds?

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Fenger, I don't know if there would be anything specifically violated although the agreement as I understood it in the long range, at least, presumes a reduction in the population at Beatrice to the appropriate level. I think that is usually a term, I am not sure what that means. Obviously if the funding isn't there to do that, why then it cannot be complied with for further reduction