

But, if they did, you'd have a cost anywhere between \$45,893 up to \$205,209, if 50 percent went through. If only 20 percent went through, which is the more accurate figure for Nebraska if you're going to extrapolate our population with other populations, that which needed actually a counselor or guardian ad litem, if only 20 percent needed that, the cost would range from 45,893 to a low, up to 81,993. So in Nebraska you're looking at anywhere between 45 to 81, I think I mentioned 20,000 to 90,000 earlier. So that's what we have at this particular...this particular point. Senator Labeledz made an interesting argument, and I hope the body rejects the argument, because it is not a valid argument in this particular case. This is not an attempt to get an A bill, and all of a sudden slow the bill down. Members of the body, you're smarter than that, I assume. Whenever you have an A bill, it doesn't slow anything up, it simply determines when it's going to be voted on. If the body, for example, adopted this amendment and there was an A bill attached, after the mainline appropriations bills would go through, and the other appropriations process would go through, we would then get the 425 and the A bill. There are 25 votes to pass 425 today, there will be 25 votes to pass it tomorrow, and there will be 25 votes to pass it next week, or the following week, or up to June 3rd, for the most part, before we get to June 5th, our sine die. If the body chose to pass just 425, it can do so. It can then reject the A bill, if it so desires. So the A bill itself does not jeopardize LB 425 one small iota, not one jeopardy in the bill. You can still pass 425 without any funding, if you so desire, that is no problem. So I reject the argument that this is a hindrance of 425; anyone that understands the system knows that it is not. Point number two, we have counties that are in terrible trouble at this point on the tax side. We have yet to address the property tax situation in this state. But we have counties out there that are at their max levies. We have counties that are going to be hurting tremendously on whatever decisions we may make as far as taxes that they may have to pay in a refund. All I'm saying is, if we're going to be bold enough to mandate young women into going through this process, we should be bold enough to say we, in the state, are willing to put our money where our mouths are, we're willing to put this amount of money and say we are going to appropriate it so it is not a hindrance to the counties, it is not a hindrance to any of the county courts, we're going to put the money there because we think it's a good proposal. That's all it is, it's shifting of whose going to pay. Not only is it a reasonable amendment, it's one which makes sense, which