

the committee action cut back the dollars or cut back the service offer of the Voc Rehab Department. That's not the case at all. The question of Senator Dierks' amendment is, how much does this body want to micromanage, one. Two, the simple question is, do you want to keep the Voc Rehab Department operating the cafeteria. But either way, the cafeteria stays open, and some of the people insinuated, you know, to be on the side of the disabled, you have to vote for Senator Dierks's amendment and actually in reality Senator Dierks's amendment will serve fewer people. Senator Dierks's amendment will serve fewer people because, one, just in the environment down there, the managing department has said they cannot serve as many people as they would be in some other environment. That by itself, they will serve more people coupled with the fact the cafeteria has historically been a money loser for the department. And so just by the simple fact that in a different environment they can serve more clients, serve more of those smiling faces, as Senator Byars and Senator Labeledz, they can serve more people presently than they can with the Dierks amendment, coupled with the fact by the losing money in the cafeteria, it's \$100,000 the department loses. If they were someplace else and was not losing money, they could serve clients at \$100,000. And so don't be confused. If you want to keep the cafeteria open and you're fully supportive of voc rehab doing it, that's fine, that's the question at hand. But don't be confused that Senator Dierks's amendment is the one that is friendly to the people because actually you will serve fewer disabled people with Senator Dierks's amendment. Yes, Senator Dierks's amendment will keep them in the Capitol Building and they do do a very fine job down there. I, personally, have no qualms with that at all. My preference is to let the Voc Rehab Department serve more clients and the committee did not cut any funds whatsoever to the department. We actually increased funds. We actually increased General Funds by \$143,000 to hold them harmless so the question is not whether or not they get more money at all. The question is, can they maximize those resources in some better way than the cafeteria and serve more people? And Senator Dierks's amendment would certainly keep the cafeteria open, that's a policy decision this body can and, if they choose to, certainly should make but do not be confused that you will be serving more people by Senator Dierks's amendment. You'll probably be serving fewer people with developmental disabilities. So with that, I'd once again rise to oppose Senator Dierks's amendment.