

Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Again, members of the body, maybe if I can frame it just a little bit differently so that the members have a clear understanding of at least what the discussion, why this has caused such a more of a...less, a larger discussion than I think Senator Dierks anticipated. Right now there are about \$143,000 of Cash Funds, that money received through the money transactions through the cafeteria, that they were able to use to get federal matching monies, and the federal government came back and said, no, we're not going to let you do that. So they came to the Appropriations Committee and we said, no, this is a good thing. We like the program, we like vocational rehabilitation, we're very committed to these programs. Consequently, we put 143,000 of General Funds so that they could use that to match for federal, use for federal matching funds and that was fine. There is, however, another question that has been brought up through this process and that question is, you know, the cafeteria as it is now being managed is losing about \$100,000 a year that we are having to pick up as taxpayers. I think they call that inefficiency or I'm not sure what the term is, but we're at a loss of \$100,000 a year. Somebody somewhere came up with an idea and they said, you know, it might be possible that we can do better things. Maybe what we could do is, and again, this is an idea that is being tossed about, they are looking at it, maybe we might close the operation because it is a money loss. The \$100,000 that we're having to make up in other sources, we could use that loss that we normally would have to make up, we'll take that \$100,000 and put it into vocational rehabilitation programs that we know are working, we know that are efficient and that we can improve upon. There is a possibility that if that happens, somebody came out with another idea saying, well, what about the cafeteria itself, if that were to close, and if they used the money to enhance vocational rehabilitation that we have, would that mean there is no cafeteria? Well, no, then some private enterprise group could come in. Somebody else threw out an idea, well, could that private enterprise group in a contract, would they be able to hire then graduates from vocational rehabilitation? Well, yeah, yeah, that was an idea. That was a possibility. All of those are areas of discussion that are going on. Okay? Those are areas of discussion, only. What Senator Dierks is doing with his amendment is saying, no matter what these other options could be, no matter what we might do that may be more beneficial, we're not going to do that, we're going to say it is