

March 3, 1982

LB 522

\$30 million or something like that?

SENATOR VARD JOHNSON: Yes, I have. I have visited with Senator Warner on it and Senator Warner has told me that he thinks that a state administered system is the right way to go. He has also told me that he is always nervous about the timing as to when the cost should be picked up. Without any question the cost probably ought not to be picked up, at least under this bill, until 1983, until July, 1983. He has not expressed an opinion with respect to this whole phase in business that I am now talking about.

SENATOR NICHOL: Thank you, Senator Vard Johnson, that is fine, so with that, I think is if we can handle Senator Kahle's amendment, I would certainly be willing to move along with the bill because we are going to have to move along with this this year if we are going to get it passed.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Marsh.

SENATOR MAPSH: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I can sympathize with Senator Kahle and the wishful thinking that his proposed amendment is indicating, for he would like to see some control at the county level. The facts of the matter are, you cannot very often have successfully two levels unless one is in charge and what we are now trying to do is say the state can more economically and perhaps more fairly considering all of the residents of our state make decisions relating to the area of welfare. The question is, are you sincere in your efforts to move economically and wisely in the direction of the legislation proposed by Senator Vard Johnson which I do support? I do not support the amendment which has been offered by Senator Kahle for I think it would be extraneous language. It would muddy the legislation. It would make it more difficult to put it in place. The proposal is for no funding in the next fiscal year for the State of Nebraska. It would be much easier to have this legislation in place, to have the lead time which the states have been talking about with federal legislative bodies. We need the lead time. The counties need the lead time. It would make for a smoother process if we do not have the Kahle amendment. I still can sympathize with the intent of Senator Kahle's language but the fact is if you are trying to say there are two levels who still are in charge, it cannot be a way to economically save dollars. It cannot be the smoothest mechanism for moving into a new system. Therefore, I shall not support the Kahle amendment.