

January 4, 1990

LB 881-957, 997-1010
LR 229

If I may, Mr. President, I have a Reference Report referring LBs 881-957, and LR 229. (See pages 175-77 of the Legislative Journal.) And, Mr. President, new bills. (Read LBs 997-1010 by title for the first time. See pages 177-80 of the Legislative Journal.) Mr. President, that's all that I have at this time.

SPEAKER BARRETT PRESIDING

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Proceeding to the next item on...from the Rules Committee. Chairman Lynch.

SENATOR LYNCH: Mr. President, members, the next one is number nine identified on your list. It specifies that a motion to suspend the rules is not divisible. The reason for this, without reading it all but putting it hopefully in laymen's terms so we can understand it, is that when a motion to suspend the rules is attempted it's intended to accomplish only one thing. You don't suspend the rules to accomplish three, four, five or six different things. But, if the amendment that would accomplish one thing would, for example, suspend Rule 1, Section 2, Rule 2, Section 3, Rule 3, Section 4, because it's necessary to do that to identify those sections of the rules that serve that single purpose, you cannot divide the question and take any one of those three rule changes independently. I think, Mr. President and members, that explains the purpose and intent of this rule change and would suggest that we support it.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you, Senator Lynch. Discussion on the proposal...proposed change number nine? Senator Chambers, please.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, let me tell you what the real purpose of this rule change is. There have been attempts at various times to suspend the rules so that there can be no debate or discussion or amendment on bills, and I have indicated that I would divide that question. So the purpose of the rule is to prevent that from happening. So however many things are put into a rule suspension will have to be taken as a package. In some instances you may have a situation where people will think and believe that you should be able to suspend the rules for the purpose of taking a vote without any additional debate, amendment and so forth. And maybe that is all right. Naturally, I'm opposed to it because

January 8, 1990

LB 409, 958-1013, 1031, 1032
LR 235

SPEAKER BARRETT: Let's stand at ease until eleven-fifteen, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Okay, thank you.

EASE

CLERK: Three quick announcements. Reference will meet underneath the south balcony now. Referencing Committee, underneath the south balcony right now.

SPEAKER BARRETT PRESIDING

SPEAKER BARRETT: (Microphone not activated immediately.) ...return to the Legislative Chamber. The Legislature will reconvene and continue our discussion on the adoption of our permanent rules. Please return to the Legislative Chamber. Mr. Clerk, would you read in new bills, please.

CLERK: (Read LB 1031 and LB 1032 by title for the first time. See pages 198-99 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, in addition to those items, I have a new resolution. (Read brief summary of LR 235. See page 199 of the Journal.) That will be laid over.

I have amendments from Speaker Barrett to be printed to LE 409. Mr. President, I also have a Reference Report referring LBs 958-1013, as well as certain gubernatorial appointments received. That's all that I have, Mr. President. (See pages 199-201 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Have you a motion, Mr. Clerk, to reconsider action taken last week?

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Chambers would move to reconsider the vote on the Wesely amendment to the rules, which I believe the Legislature discussed on Thursday afternoon.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. The Chair recognizes Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, this motion is designed to reconsider the vote that was taken on

January 19, 1990

LB 159, 567, 567A, 769, 851, 900, 915
957, 964, 966, 968, 994, 997, 1010

PRESIDENT: Senator Conway.

SENATOR CONWAY: Given the nature of the dinner hour and the like, and I'm sure some people had commitments that are...they are waiting in the wings in their offices, I'd like to have a call of the house, please.

PRESIDENT: The question is, shall the house go under call? All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record, Mr. Clerk, please.

CLERK: 22 ayes, 3 nays, Mr. President, to go under call.

PRESIDENT: Okay. The house is under call. Please record your presence. Roll call vote has been requested in reverse order...in regular order, excuse me. So please look up to see if your light is lit, illuminated. Senator Haberman, would you record your presence, please. Thank you. We're looking for Senator Bernard-Stevens and Senator Dierks. Sergeant-at-Arms, how you coming with Senator...Well, there is Senator Bernard-Stevens. Senator Dierks. There he is. Ladies and gentlemen, the question is the advancement of the bill. Roll call vote has been requested in regular order. Will you please hold down the conversation so the Clerk can hear your response. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: (Roll call vote taken. See page 438 of the Legislative Journal.) 25 ayes, 16 nays, Mr. President, on the advancement of the bill.

PRESIDENT: The bill is advanced. Mr. Clerk, do you have anything good for the cause?

CLERK: Mr. President, your Committee on Urban Affairs, whose Chair is Senator Hartnett, to whom was referred LB 851, instructs me to report the same back to the Legislature with the recommendation it be advanced to General File; LB 957, General File; LB 964, General File; LB 966, General File; LB 968, General File. Health and Human Services Committee, whose Chair is Senator Wesely, reports LB 900 to General File; LB 915, General File; LB 994, General File; LB 997, General File; and LB 1010, General File. Senator Withem has amendments to LB 567 and LB 567A; Senator Smith to LB 769. And I have notice of hearing from Transportation Committee, Government Committee,

February 13, 1990 LB 159, 163A, 624, 642, 862, 923, 943
976, 1010, 1086, 1090, 1091, 1141, 1171
1180, 1195, 1197, 1238
LR 239

PRESIDENT: Mr. Clerk, do you have anything for the record?

CLERK: Mr. President, I do. A reminder, the Speaker would like to have a meeting of Committee Chairs tomorrow morning at eight-thirty, Committee Chairs tomorrow morning at eight-thirty in Room 2102.

Mr. President, your Committee on Education whose Chair is Senator Withem reports LB 1086 to General File, LB 1090 General File with amendments, LB 1195 General File, those signed by Senator Withem, and LB 1180 indefinitely postponed, LB 1197 indefinitely postponed. Urban Affairs reports LB 943 indefinitely postponed, LB 1171 indefinitely postponed, signed by Senator Hartnett. Banking reports LB 624 to General File, that signed by Senator Landis. (See pages 779-80 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, a series of priority bills designations. Senator Wesely as Chair of Health and Human Services selects LB 923, Senator Withem selects LR 239CA, Senator Warner selected LB 1141. General Affairs Committee selected LB 862 as one of its priority bills, that's offered by Senator Smith. Senator Dierks has selected LB 1238.

I have amendments to be printed to LB 163A by Senator Schimek. (See page 781 of the Legislative Journal.)

A confirmation report from the Education Committee. That is offered by Senator Withem.

A series of adds, Mr. President. Senator Weihing would like to add his name to LB 642, Senator McFarland to LB 1010, Senator Lowell Johnson to LB 976 and Senator Pirsch to LB 1091 and Senator Warner to LB 159, AM2372. That is all that I have, Mr. President. (See page 782 of the Legislative Journal.)

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Moore, please.

SENATOR MOORE: Yes, Mr. President, I move we adjourn until 9:00 a.m., February 14, Valentine's Day.

idea behind the 518 program, which has been a very successful program, was to take away a disincentive which existed in the job support program that would...which was created when these women would find jobs that didn't provide adequate health care benefits and adequate child care benefits. So the 518 program has been in effect, and it is now really incorporated into the federal child...or federal law. So we have had a couple of years track record on it and it has been, I am told, a very successful program. One of the problems that remain to be solved was the problem that exists when a woman finds work under the program and is not paid for 30 days after she finds work. So she is effectively cut off benefits at a date, and then she receives no pay in her job for 30 days after that. So the idea behind LB 1010 which now is incorporated into the committee amendments in 536 is to pay what really is a job incentive grant to these individuals who find work, to give them the security, the feeling of security that they are going to have some income during that first 30 days of employment. The cost, first of all, LB 1010 requested a payment equal to one month of ADC benefits. We amended that down in the committee to two weeks of ADC benefits. The total cost is \$281,000 and is, in my opinion, an extremely important part of the 518 program. If we don't remove that insecurity or feeling of insecurity, there is created or remains a great fairly significant obstacle to these women in their efforts to find and to keep employment. You have been sent around or are being sent around a handout, somewhere, which details the story of, I think, one woman in Douglas County who gave her testimonial about her experiences in trying to find work, and then finally went to college at Bellevue College, and is doing extremely well in Business Administration, and has been helped by these programs. And each year, we have a poverty seminar that we run in Douglas County, and we listen to these women and they give us their concerns and their problems, and from those poverty seminars, we fashioned LB 518 and also LB 1010, and this problem of finding that security for that first 30 days of work was identified to us at the last summer's poverty luncheon, poverty luncheon, as being a very, very significant problem. We believe, and I think the department believes, and certainly these mothers believe, that if they are given this boost, or this incentive, or job incentive grant, as I call it, that it is going to have a significant impact on both their desire and their ability to take care of their families and to find work. Because, obviously, the whole idea of welfare should be getting people off of welfare, not keeping them on the welfare rolls, and that was the idea behind the LB 518 program,