mothers who work, who have the problem because they can't find...it is not economically feasible for these people to take care of three children, so they don't do it. So they go...they want to go get a job. If they could have a couple more youngsters to care for, then they could be on a financial footing where they would be able to get into that day care business on a very small scale, take care of a few more children, have more day care facilities available for the mothers that want to work, and it is just that simple. It is a real problem because it is not worthwhile for them to go through all the red tape of cercification and really is unnecessary in that environment because people know each other. People know. People take that responsibility to put their children in an environment which they are comfortable with, and I would ask that this amendment be adopted.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Wesely, did you wish to speak about the Lamb amendment, please, followed by Senator Dierks.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, members, I appreciate Senator Lamb's concern and I know he has got a sincere interest in this matter. There is another bill, LB 462, that is on General File that deals with this. I'd really ask Senator Lamb to consider withdrawing the amendment. The thing about it is we have already complicated the issue quite a bit, and this would further complicate matters quite a great deal. We have already adopted the Smith amendment. The Smith amendment does allow for overlap, does allow for flexibility, as have recently been adopted by rules and regs that were enacted as a result of legislation we passed a couple of years ago. There is a number of problems with Senator Lamb's bill that I have great concern about, and I'd really rather not get into that whole argument at this point. I would prefer if Senator Lamb would just simply allow us to go forward with the legislation as it currently is constituted dealing with the subject matter that we have. the issue of changing the level of registration and licensure I think should be a matter dealt with separately. Senator Beck has talked about complications, and I just don't think we need to further complicate the bill. In addition, I am certain that this particular amendment would be unconstitutional, and we will try and track down an Attorney General's Opinion and share that with Senator Lamb indicating that problem. And so I think it would be best to reject the Lamb amendment and proceed with the bill without further amendment and allow us to deal with the issues that are already currently in the legislation.