

They handle things in special studies effectively and there is no other committee that I probably would put that under who would be around year-round, like the Exec Board. And so I...whether we do that in committee amendments now, or adopt the committee amendments and then bring an amendment back in. But somehow, Senator Hall, I think you're right, you've got to get some accountability or somebody has got to have a little bit of control over what's going to occur. Thank you, Madam President.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Kristensen. Before going on to the next speaker, I'd like to have the Legislature welcome Ruth Hoffman (phonetic), administrator, and eight clients from the North Platte Opportunity Center, who are guests today of Senator Bernard-Stevens. They're in the north balcony. Would you please welcome these people to the Legislature today. Thank you for being with us. Senator Robinson.

SENATOR ROBINSON: Madam President, members of the body, I have no problem with what Senator Hall is saying. I would like to see the committee amendments adopted. But the committee had a concern about the funding, and they felt that the Legislature ought to discuss just what they want to do with that part. And I'm sure that if the committee amendments are moved on...amendment by Senator Hall, I'm sure I'd support that. But, basically, that was the thought of the committee. They're concerned about the...what the costs would be and they wanted a discussion from the full Legislature. I think as far as the '95, or excuse me, extending that to two years. I think what Senator Kristensen said, we thought that would be rushing that too much. So I would hope you could support the committee amendments. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Robinson. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President and members. I rise in support of the committee amendments. Fine, we'll deal with it, I guess, between now and Selec' File, but I clearly...it sounds like there's consensus to adopt an amendment that spells out, that would, in essence, trigger the A bill. I just flat out missed the committee change dealing with the additional year, so that is where my concern with regard to striking the E clause came up. With that, knowing that it's going to be at least a two year process, that makes sense. There's no need to retain the E clause with that change in the committee amendments. For those purposes, I'll support the committee