

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

March 7, 2000

LB 1101

the county, or a city and county working together gobble up this little bit of money. That's all the questions I would ask you at this point. But the amendment that I'm offering would simply make some of the language a little better. It would say "in substantial compliance with" rather than "accordance with". And then I will ask what the term "substantial" means, so that we can be sure that we're not being given loose terms that allow any bureaucracy to do anything it wants to under the language of the bill. "Substantial" is always a word that leads to argument when a dispute arises. When you allow the head of this department to establish the amount of the stipend that doesn't just mean, Senator Redfield, it will be more. It means it can be less. It means it can be nothing. It could be a token amount. If this is to be done and it is to be a new program, we found out under the questioning of Senator Don Pederson that it's not envisioned as a permanent program even though it doesn't have a sunset. I think when you're going to create a new program and it's supposed to benefit people who really need it, that program should be one of substance and not be a flag that sounds good and is written about in glowing terms at the beginning and then it just peters out and two years from now nobody knows where it went, nobody knows why it went, and nobody is that much concerned about it. So I am not satisfied that the language that's in this green copy right now achieves the goal that was expressed, but my amendment that's up there now would simply offer a word that I think is more suitable in a statute, and that word is "compliance" rather than "accordance".

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Chambers. On the Chambers amendment to LB 1101, Senator Stuhr, followed by Senators Bourne, Beutler, Chambers, Don Pederson, and Janssen. Senator Stuhr.

SENATOR STUHR: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Legislature. I, too, stand in support of the concept of this bill. I do support Senator Chambers' amendment, but I do also want to make a few other comments in regard. We've been talking about the two programs that are now in use throughout the state, the Lincoln program and the Omaha program, and I'm not sure that I agree with Senator Chambers in changing some of that wording for "city" and "counties", in the fact that it's my understanding that Lincoln's program serves eight counties.