

SENATOR HALL: Just real briefly, I opposed this yesterday. I am going to oppose it throughout. I think it is easy to pick off programs like this and I want to make sure that it is in the record that, and I think Senator Nelson touched on this somewhat, but I just want to spell it out that it is not because of the way the program has been operated. In the last couple of years, I think it has been very well operated. The amount of money that we have gone from originally, I think it was around \$100,000, down to 30, the quality of the program has not suffered. If anything, it has been improved over those years, and I just want to lay that out so that people understand that it is not, I guess, a statement to the folks who run that who work for us that by any stretch of the imagination we don't think they are doing a good job. It is just something that is easy for us to cut. I am going to continue to oppose it, but I want to say that...I want to go on record arguing that they have done an outstanding job putting on this program for the time that it has been alive. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Hall. Anyone else wishing to speak to the advancement of LB 21? Seeing no one, all those in favor of the advancement say aye. Opposed no. It is advanced. LB 3.

CLERK: Mr. President, LB 3, first item, no E & R, Senator. I do have amendments from Senators Moore and Ashford. (See AM09SS on page 125 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the amendment that Senator Ashford and myself started introducing last night. This is, the amendment is basically 1272, the bill introduced last year. This is the amendment that the Appropriations Committee recommended the body adopt for the wards of the court perspective. I think, if I am not incorrect, there is a following amendment introduced by Senator Withem which I support that addresses over and above what this amendment does. At this stage, you are well aware this amendment will terminate state payments to children in an individual foster home, but does not affect the state payments towards children in a group home or institution. And, basically, the difference is that, as you remember, the Governor's number showed 5 million across, this is more like \$1.7 million. Actually, I think we are handing out