

January 15, 1980

LB 525

CLERK: 30 ayes and no nays, Mr. President, on the motion to adopt.

PRESIDENT: Motion carries, the Haberman amendment is adopted. Are there any further amendments, Mr. Clerk?

CLERK: I have nothing further on the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: What do you wish to do with the bill as amended, Senator Sieck?

SENATOR SIECK: Advance the bill.

PRESIDENT: Motion is to advance LB 525 as amended. Any further discussion? Senator Lamb.

SENATOR LAMB: Just a couple of questions, Senator Sieck.

PRESIDENT: Senator Sieck, will you respond?

SENATOR SIECK: Yes, Senator Lamb.

SENATOR LAMB: I think that I didn't hear all of the discussion, Senator Sieck, but I think I did hear someone say that it is not good to have these homes really to close together, is that correct?

SENATOR SIECK: That is correct.

SENATOR LAMB: I guess my question is why is it better to have more of them in a small town than it is in a large town in relation to the population? It seems to me that we would have these more concentrated because according to the committee amendment in a smaller town you could have a number of them where in a large city in spacing or in relation to the population you would have not nearly as many. Would you explain that?

SENATOR SIECK: Okay, the reason for this is that generally the small towns are representing a large farming area where there could be individuals out in that community and they wouldn't necessarily establish a home out in the rural sectors because of the convenience and all of this. So the home would be established in the community. This would have to be worked out. Of course with Haberman's amendment.....takes care of that small problem that you feel that maybe there would be two homes in a thousand population the way the amendment that Haberman has in it could...well he says there wouldn't be any but, there could still have one.

SENATOR LAMB: Okay thank you. It still seems to me that it is over balanced towards the small areas above a thousand or