

to go and that is let's get money out to those communities so that they can develop programs that serve children and families before they have problems. So I think I'm...I definitely am going to support this and recognize that again, given the vague nature of the amendment that was attached and the concerns that were raised in the Attorney General's Opinion with no definitions of any of these terms contained in the bill, that I think we better do this just to be on the safe side so that we're able to continue with the original intent of the bill and that was to allow communities to bring in their proposals for what they identify as their primary needs for children and families in the communities. It does require a complicated system of community consent, community approval. A cross-section of community people must be involved and simply put the money out there and let the community decide what their priority needs are in terms of their unique needs to serve their children and families. So I believe Senator Smith has probably offered an amendment here that will allow this to go forward regardless of whatever kinds of legal questions might be raised around that particular amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Mr. President. I guess I have to stand in opposition to this and the reasoning behind it is this. I think there are many members in the body who would not vote for LB 662 if, in fact, there is a chance that money would be...that the funding would be used for abortion services. The intent of a severability clause, excuse me, is to evidence an intent of the Legislature that that clause is not an intrinsic part of the bill. It's not a part of the bill upon which support for that bill is gathered. I don't think, at least from talking to several people, I don't think that is indeed the case. I think there are those, including myself, who support the bill so long as the funding does not go to that...for that purpose. If by some...and I still subscribe to the notion that it's not unconstitutional in any manner but if by some fluke it became unconstitutional, or it was declared unconstitutional, then I would not be in support of the program, knowing that funds would be used in that manner. I think that's...we have to know what severability clausings...generally, I support the severability clauses but I think in this case the issues are so intertwined that without or if that clause is not a part of the bill, then I think the bill itself would lose some support. The better approach, I think, is...I guess that's not really an