

May 8, 1981

LB 404

the philosophy of having these individuals responsible to the Governor. For that reason I would ask you to adopt my amendment to the Warner amendment and then adopt the Warner amendment in its entirety.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Marsh.

SENATOR MARSH: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, Senator Cullan, was this heard in public hearing, either your amendment to Senator Warner's, or Senator Warner's amendment?

SENATOR CULLAN: Excuse me. Yes, Senator Marsh, LB...I believe the number was 295 sponsored by Senator Nichol would have placed the Commission on Aging under the auspices of the Governor's office. That bill did have a public hearing and the committee rejected that bill, but for many other reasons. So the concept of placing the Department of Aging...or the Commission on Aging under the Governor was heard before the Public Health and Welfare Committee.

SENATOR MARSH: We have just 13 days remaining. Thank you very much, Senator Cullan. We have just 13 days remaining in this legislative session. When this aspect was not heard on LB 404, I have real hesitancy without passing on the value of the proposed amendment. If it can be postponed until 1983, I feel it would be much better to bring that as a separate bill next year, have it heard where the public has an opportunity to respond to this element rather than slide it in at the very last minute. I do not feel this is the kind of amendment we should be asking at the Select File stage of debate. I am not in support of the amendment to the amendment, but I will be voting for the amendment to the amendment for, at least, there could be some discussion of it next year. With the proposed amendment which Senator Warner presented for us, it would not go into effect in 1983 but rather sooner. So even though I am not in favor of Senator Cullan's amendment, I will be voting for it. I will not be voting for Senator Warner's amendment.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I am opposing Senator Cullan's amendment as I don't believe his reasoning holds water, and if it does he would have used the same reasoning on the Department of Health. He would have wanted to wait until January of 1983 for that also. This doesn't even fit in with the fiscal cycle of the code agencies or the Department of