

"governmental subdivision" and there is somewhat of a broader definition of that than one that we would sometimes use, but by and large those funds are direct health care for people who have a problem, which would be one reason, another factor was that some of the mental retardation had been excluded by other amendments that had been offered by the body. In case of alcohol, drug and mental health, if you look back at the discussion of LB 280 and 280A and the purposes there, there was some rationale. All the rest were just equally done with just one percent as has been proposed on numerous other alternatives, some at one and some at two and some at three, and the school lunch program, of course, obviously falls in that broad general category of one percent that was not excluded and I would suggest that the amendment not be adopted.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Lamb, please. The question has been called. Do I see five hands? I do. The question is, shall debate cease? All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record Mr. Clerk please.

ASSISTANT CLERK: 26 ayes, 1 nay to cease debate Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Debate is ceased. Senator Chambers, would you like to close, please.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes, I would Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, Senator Warner gave a rationale for why certain programs on this sheet did not suffer a cut but I don't really think I heard a rationale meaning a justification for cutting \$8,000 out of the school lunch program. Maybe there is no rationale. I thought I heard some people with the Appropriations Committee say these one percent across the board cuts are not the way to write a budget. That is what I thought I heard. I thought I heard them opposing a 2 percent across the board cut on agencies that have lobbyists and the ability to speak for themselves. But then we come to a program like this, the school lunch program, and they go, they say we cut across the board on that. So we change the philosophy. I had said this is an inconsistent piece of paper yesterday and this demonstrates it. You have got both philosophies locked up in here because whatever the Appropriations Committee does is right because the Appropriations Committee did it. That is just nine people and they don't even see everything the same way