

May 2, 1979

LB 138

what happened at the end of five years? Not only had the estimate of the amount of money required better than doubled, but we then proceeded to extend the program totally. Now the best way to avoid getting into this proposition is to defeat this bill totally. We are going to take money from the same place the county takes money, and to say the county has a burden is unfortunate because this state has the same burden and extracts the money from the same people. I am very much opposed to this concept. If the counties do not have that expense, the local citizen has no idea what that expense is, and this is another of those covert moves to hide the cost of government from the local taxpayer at the only place he realizes it and that's at the county tax level. But this kind of a postponement until the future...with some future legislature is at best a coward's approach to it or better yet it's like borrowing money from the bartender to put off the hangover tomorrow. There just is no way out of this. Either we face up to the fact that this is an expensive program, that it is badly administered, and that it probably should be brought under much stronger control at the county level, the only place where the people are known where the services are delivered ultimately to the consumer, and to remove the county from this responsibility to me is unfortunate and certainly to postpone tomorrow's hangover is even more unfortunate. I would oppose this motion.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Fowler and then Senator DeCamp. Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: I would rise to support Senator Hoagland's amendment, although I guess if Senator Murphy on one side finds it unacceptable and Senator Goodrich and Kahle on the other side find it unacceptable, it may not have a great chance of success. But I think it's worth looking at some of the projected costs for four years. I think the personal property tax exemption is an example although I would use it in a different way than Senator Murphy has and that is that this increment every year, the commitment we make now limits our flexibility in future years as far as budgets. I think what Senator Hoagland is saying, let's be a little cautious about this, let's go two years, if it looks like we can meet this need, if there's no real problems then we can continue it. I think that sort of caution is well worth exercising. What is not emphasized I think on this floor is that the state already picks up a major share of medicaid costs, and as that cost at the