

May 4, 1981

LB 561

It automatically would take care of any A bills also and the hard choice is one that I don't enjoy pointing out but the hard choice, nevertheless, remains that some additions to the budget have to be voted down or a number of them have to be voted down if you want to stay within the existing rates. When you want to look at any single program, I don't know of a one that I couldn't argue with some kind of justification, logical justification, to increase. I also know that you can't do them all or begin to do them all. So I would urge that the body not adopt this amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Labeledz, and then Senator Maresh.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I support Senator Chambers amendment, not because I am antiabortion but because I am pro...for helpless children. It is a very modest increase as Senator Chambers put out. I have always supported increasing very modestly the ADC program as I have always asked for increases or supported increases for unemployment. These are very unfortunate people and I believe that any time that we have any type of program we are going to have some abuses but I think of all the little helpless children that this modest increase will help and I don't think that when we go ahead here and put millions of dollars on other bills, on other appropriations, asking it for children and for those unfortunate people that are not able to take care of themselves, I do not believe that it is too excessive. I would urge the adoption of Senator Chambers amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Vard Johnson.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I rise in support of Senator Chambers' amendment. I think both Senator Chambers and Senator Labeledz have very carefully articulated the reasons why this amendment is a sound and decent humane and appropriate amendment. Now just a couple of things I want to call to the attention of the body. The first one is that this last legislative session we did pass LB 789 which set statutory maximums in exactly the amounts Senator Chambers is proposing by his amendment and we also appropriated at that time the money to conform to the new statutory maximums. However, the Governor through a line item veto reduced the amount and, frankly, I concluded when he exercised his veto prerogatives he did so believing that it would be probably more appropriate for us to go to the new statutory maximum in a two year shot as opposed to a one year shot and so all Senator Chambers is doing is fulfilling the second year of what the body last year in effect agreed to do. A couple of other things I would like to call