from the Department of Labor, the cash funds and some federal monies, and these cash funds come from fines and penalties that employers because they have paid their levied contributions either to unemployment, workers comp, those kinds of things, a...late or they haven't paid them so they are being caught up but the bulk of it comes from the cash fund there are some federal monies involved. But the principle here is one of, I guess, does this belong as a job responsibility or duty of the Department of Economic Development? I would argue that it does not. That this is a issue that has been one traditionally, and I think everyone would agree that it falls within the parameters and the guidelines, the expertise of the Department of Labor. That is where it really should stay. In order to, it is a little bit of the cart before the horse, LB 813 is before us and there is a need to strike the million dollar transfer and then deal with the issue of the program in 305 when it follows. But I would urge the body to support the amendment. It does, would wipe out that transfer of funds and there will be an amendment that follows in LB 305 that would strike the portion, Section 3 of the bill, that creates a job training cash fund in the Department of Economic Development because I don't see where there is a (A) a need to strip duties and responsibilities that the Department of Labor currently perform and I don't think there are any provisions that would keep them from continuing to perform those. I think very likely what we are doing here is setting up a duplication or a duplicative program and I don't understand why transferring this money or creating this program within the Department of Economic Development when it currently exists the Department of Labor and they do an excellent job there. So I would urge the body to adopt the Chizek amendment that would strike the funding for this program. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Scofield, do you care to discuss the motion?

SENATOR SCOFIELD: Yes, Mr. President and members. The only concerns I would raise on this I guess are largely technical and Senator Hall has addressed one already as far as saying that, yes, he is going to amend the language in 305 to be consistent with this. The other issue that I think needs to be considered here is that as this is currently presented it would be necessary to find somewhere some administrative funds, which would not be accounted for up till now. Senator Hall, you may want to consider that as you bring this up. The background on