

December 10, 1986 LB 1
 LR 2

Department was fined, and I'm not absolutely correct on my figures, but I think it was around \$350,000 because they were not doing things correctly and if we further destroy and erode the base for those people to do their work, it could add up to being fined more in the future. So I would strongly suggest that you support Senator Chambers' amendment. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Warner, please. Yes, Senator Warner, please.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, I would urge to reject the amendment. I can remember back in the sixties when we used to make the argument that we could spend one dollar of state money and we'd get one dollar of federal money or two dollars of federal money and, therefore, we were getting three dollars for one, but that argument is long gone. In order to get the amount of federal funds we have to spend four hundred and some or close to \$500,000, so I'm not sure that that is a meritorious argument. The thing that I would hope you keep in mind, I'm sure in our own minds that there would not be 100 offices across the state were it not for the fact that they at one time were all county offices, one time supported by the counties in part and the state has taken all that over now. It seems to me that there is an opportunity to bring some efficiency in management. I do not view that as a parallel with reduced services, I don't believe it is. We have other agencies to serve statewide needs with fewer offices and at least I am not aware of complaints that they do not adequately cover and I think that this is the same case. A portion of the reduction also, as I mentioned, was NCCY and they would be moving some children to foster homes that currently are in group homes. The facts are that what happens is that some of those group homes may be one or two individuals part of the time if they have a capacity of six but they are fully staffed all the time and you actually acquire a net savings by not using some of those and using more use of foster homes rather than maintain a staff for a group home that is only used to full capacity part of the time. And from the terms of the individual, assuming of course, the foster home is right, perhaps they are even better served. Certainly it is more of a family situation. So I would oppose the restoration of these funds and urge that you leave the reduction as it is in place.

SPLAKER NICHOL: We're going to recess shortly here, but while the Legislature is in session and capable of transacting business, I propose to sign and do sign LR 2. Mr. Clerk, do you