

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

April 22, 1999 LB 835

consultation. In an effort to move forward and certainly not to be obstructionist with regard to solving this problem, I would withdraw this amendment in favor of that which will follow.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Okay, the amendment is withdrawn.  
Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Wehrbein would move to amend.  
(FA107, Legislative Journal page 1603.)

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Wehrbein, you're recognized to open on your amendment to LB 835.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Mr. Speaker, this is somewhat of a compromise. I don't know that everyone is on it. If you will recall, Senator Brashear was May 1st. This moves the date to March 15th, not a perfect situation at this point. I recognize some want to keep the pressure on and so do I, but from the practical standpoint of setting up a statewide system and then having a federal system come in either later or sooner is the problem that I was concerned with and, frankly, it got to me this morning. It's a \$57,000 General Fund issue probably to get started with some seed money, because we don't have time to have the General...the Cash Funds, the assessment catch up to the need of reporting. So this is somewhere between the January 1st and the February 1st and the March and the May 1st dates that we're talking about. If the bill is to become effective, it's 90 days upon the end of the session, that makes it about September...in September. Then that process starts. And it was originally said to be January when the reporting would be available of the reports. This delays that to March...February 15th--a little more time for feds to react; keeps the pressure on; does not, hopefully, have a duplicative system of reporting; and will still do what Senator Dierks wants to do and I endorse what he wants to do. I...I don't think that it serves our purpose to have a duplicative system in place even for a few short weeks or months, if we have to set up a system. This gives us a little more time to see the feds react. It is somewhat...quite a bit sooner than Iowa, which said July 1st of 2000, somewhat later than...than October or the January date that Senator Dierks wants, but it does also give us time next session to come back and react, if we are so inclined, to lack