

September 29, 1992 LB 20

three. And I guess, I, you know, I am going to very, very begrudgingly support this amendment if only for the sake of getting on with it. And there's two concerns I have. One is the concern I have of I hate...I don't know the proper word I need to use, but I guess I have never, you know, having one or two people steer the body, a very clear majority, I have a problem with, obviously, if it was...I was calling the shots, I would trudge ahead and get the policy I felt was the right thing to do, given the time. So I have a concern about, shall we say, submitting to Senator Chambers and I think that sets a bad precedent that will continue to haunt us as we go on, but we'll live with that. Second, I guess the other concern I have is that the million two, I guess I question if we really want to spend that money towards helping needy women in the State of Nebraska, my own opinion is you're far better off with the prenatal side of things, raising that eligibility standard up above a hundred percent, that a million two would be much better spent there than it is here. My thought is if you, for whatever reason, if you think you can afford to do this, I think you would be much wiser to spend that money on the prenatal side of the component as opposed to here. I think, since all of your dollars you deal with are on the state level, you make the argument of investment, I think that would be a much better investment of state dollars, would help more people provide for healthier babies in the State of Nebraska and I just think that would be where the money ought to be spent. But, having said both of those things, since it does not appear that the body wants to continue to endure Senator Chambers and in the interest of getting on and getting along and going along, I will very begrudgingly support the amendment and, hopefully, advance LB 20. And, from my own personal point of view, maybe...maybe, depending on what happens come next session, I think if there's still a problem with the revenues matching expenditures, the rest of LB 20, I think, should certainly be on the table at that point in time. (Microphone off.) ...would like the balance of my time.

SENATOR WITHEM PRESIDING

SENATOR WITHEM: Senator Haberman, you have about two minutes.

SENATOR HABERMAN: I would like to tell the body that I am convinced of this figure now. The compromise costs 1.2 percent (sic) million in a loss. We lose that much due to the compromise. If the Chambers amendment is adopted, I have