

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

March 7, 2000

LB 1101

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...we can further discuss the bill.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Chambers, you're recognized to close on your amendment to LB 1101.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, this amendment ties into what I just got through discussing. On page 2, we find this phraseology, these three words, "in substantial accord (sic)". I think it would be better if you're going to put that in there to say "in substantial compliance" with this federal requirement or this federal law because you're allowing material standards, categories of service to be established for this state by what is found in those federal enactments. So if you're going to refer to them, but the state, these agencies don't have to really comply, then why even put it in? Why not just write into the Nebraska statutes the services that are to be performed? Why not write into the statute the categories of population to be served? Why cannot we just do that? If you have a federal regulation, and let's say it goes on for 30 pages, then to know what the law is in Nebraska that makes reference to it, you got to read all those 30 pages. Why don't we just put in this statute what it is we mean. Then we can better see if the \$200,000 is going to meet the cost of those services. And if not, should the sham be worked on these older people? If there is overlapping, if there is duplication, should the bill be narrowed so that if there is a specific area of need, the bill aims at that need? In medicine, they call it a "magic bullet." Don't just fill somebody's body with antibiotics because those kill good germs, too, if you can focus on whatever part of the body is infected and the pathogen that is causing the problem. Focus there and take care of that and leave all the healthy tissue, all the healthful parts of the body alone. This bill does not ensure that Omaha and Lincoln will not get all this money. It does not ensure that counties and cities will not get this money and do something else with it. All of that is open and up in the air. I do not trust the bureaucracies and I'm not satisfied yet that this bill really meets the need that it says it's aimed at. But this amendment that you're voting on simply substitutes the word "compliance" for "accordance". Thank you, Mr. President.