

agency that was going to be in charge of the job training program. And the committee chose to designate the Department of Economic Development, but this didn't mean that the committee felt positively that this was the agency that should administer the program. There wasn't a lot of good information presented at the hearing, nor after the hearing about the program. There was just a need for something to be done, so the bill was advanced out. I see that the study, whether this is the proper group to do it or not, I'm not sure, but there certainly could be some more study as far as finding what existing job training resources are available to individuals that are in need of these programs, and the more information that we can get, the better informed we can be when we consider LB 885, and it will provide additional information to our committee in formulating the proper type of job training program we should have in this state. So I am supportive of the...this particular section of the amendment. Thank you.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Senator Abboud. Senator Maurstad. Senator Maurstad waives. Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you. I rise in support of the Chambers amendment which, by the way, only sets a date by which this has to...report has to be done, which is December, '96, I believe. But I would like to respond to Senator Witek's comments, and, well, also respond to Senator Abboud. Senator Abboud is exactly right. That bill that did come out of committee, it was worth looking at, the idea of how we consolidate job training. I think the Labor Department ought to work with the Business and Labor Committee. I think the Business and Labor Committee ought to take the lead on it for our Legislature, and take a look at the whole issue because we have got scattered across state government various job training entities and activities, and it seems to me that, and everybody has looked at this, that we can do a better job on job training. Whether that bill is the answer is the question, but that we can do a better job is clear. So this effort to try and ask for the Labor Department to do more work and that they were supposed to do last year that didn't get done seems absolutely legitimate, and the concern about the minimum wage, I don't know if Senator Witek voted for the welfare bill last year, but this language that we've got in this proposal is exactly what we had last year. We did pull out some sections that were completed by the Labor Department, so this is simply those areas that were not completed by the labor study that was supposed to be done this last interim. So if you