

strong, we must recognize that we have not done it independently, that there are others who have helped us on our way, who have helped us achieve and succeed where we have had successes and achievement, and we need to help others in like situation. This is one way that we can do it. If we do not have the time to do it individually, we can do it collectively. We can say that this is our commitment. Now we are only asking in this amendment for 50 percent of the funding with the cash in place. You say, well, that cash should be easy to raise. Each one of you has conducted a political campaign. How many sustaining club memberships for a thousand dollars have you sold? How many \$33,000 figures have you been able to raise easily? I say that to cash fund these agencies is still going to be very, very difficult for these people and I think that the commitment on our part in this tight budgetary year of only 50 percent is minimal but it at least is saying we are still a compassionate Legislature and we are still a compassionate state and we are recognizing these people in our society who have been disenfranchised in some way who need our help. The editorial which I have placed before you from the Lincoln Star I think says it well. If you have not read it, I commend it to you for your reading. We must be a voice for the powerless and you have all seen that powerlessness operate these last two days. You have seen the looks on the faces of the people in the Rotunda and through the glass. You have seen that they need help but they do not understand the political process in here, and even we who think we sometimes understand it have seen something go awry and this is what has happened if we eliminate these agencies. I would ask you to return this bill for the adoption of this amendment. It is the caring thing to do and the intelligent thing to do. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Hannibal, Senator DeCamp, Senator Morehead, in that order.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Well, Mr. Speaker, we have two issues before us here. We have one issue which is the rightness or wrongness of the amendment as to what it is going to do, what it won't do, whether it is the proper thing to do or whether it isn't. We also have the procedural issue ahead of us and I would like to be corrected if I am wrong but let me point out what I believe are the scenarios possible to us at this stage with regard to LB 722E. If we pull the bill back from Final Reading and adopt an amendment, any