

April 6, 1982

LB 761

half a million dollar price tag because to cut it out jeopardizes the possibility of federal funds, jeopardizes an ongoing program, tends to inhibit efficient welfare work, and, finally, continues to keep us in a posture where we cannot be as efficient as we really ought to be. Incidentally, there are some larger plans for the administration of human services programs in the state than having one type of program administered by the Welfare Department, another type of program administered by the Labor Department, a third type of program administered by the Department of Corrections, a fourth type of program administered by the Department of Public Institutions. The larger plans are to develop a casework service that cuts across these various human services elements so that a family with given problems can be addressed by one caseworker who is prepared to deal with the unemployment issues, who is prepared to deal with the need based issues, who is prepared to deal with any possible criminality, and the like, and the ultimate objective, and it is a long term objective, of some of our public employees, and our well-placed public employees, is to put in line a system that will allow that kind of cross-program cutting, and the computerized information support service is a vital tool to that ultimate accomplishment. Now I would ask you to adopt this particular amendment even though it costs a pretty good chunk of money because I really do think that it makes eminent sense for us to give the state a mechanical tool, an electronic tool that makes people more productive, makes them more efficient, tends to eliminate staff that is now needed to do hand processing of material, tends to reduce fraud, tends to reduce caseworker error, and provides for a better delivery system. I would ask you to support my motion to bring the bill back for this specific amendment.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, Senator Johnson has made some very good points, and if it wasn't for the money, I would support him. The problem, well, it is not a problem. Let me put it this way, the budget as of a few minutes ago is in effect balanced. There is about \$37,000 to the good so whenever you add anything, I would hope that you would have an accompanying motion to cut somewhere else so that we can stay balanced and not get in the position where we got the other day where we ended up \$6.9 million appropriation over anticipated receipts, and notwithstanding the logic of what Senator Johnson has said, this was a proposition that the Appropriations Committee took out quite some time ago. It was not taken out now in the later cuts. It was taken out earlier. I

10278