

April 19, 1979

LB 226

want to introduce your amendment now?

SENATOR LAMB: Yes, please.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Do you want to read the amendment?

CLERK: Mr. President, the amendment reads as follows: (Read Lamb amendment as found on page 1565 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER MARVEL: The Chair recognizes Senator Lamb for purposes of consideration of his second amendment.

SENATOR LAMB: Mr. Chairman, as I explained, the intent of LB 226 is not to deprive these handicapped children of any of the programs that they now have and so it has been brought to my attention that there may have been some children, and it is a relatively low number of children, who would not be under any program under the original provisions of LB 226. So I offer this amendment as my good friend, Senator Lewis, would say, in the spirit of compromise because it is not my intent to have any of these children lose any of the services that they now have. This will cost something on the order of \$69,000 according to fiscal analysts and I would urge the adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Is there any further discussion on the Lamb amendment? Senator Lewis, do you wish to speak to the second Lamb amendment?

SENATOR LEWIS: Yes, I do, Mr. President. Mr. President, I arise to oppose the Lamb amendment. Basically I want to tell you it says two things and I want you to read it very carefully and I want to commend Senator Lamb on couching it in those words. The State Department may. That means if they so desire; if they care to; if they wish; if the whims are right; may do that; not required. Secondly, it would be a very unusual situation where some children under the same conditions were served in some cases but would not be served in other cases. If you had a program in '77-'78 they would be served. If you didn't, too bad. Three years from now it would be a tough break for a kid. So it appears to me that we might as well get down to the substance of the issue and, Mr. Chairman, I am going to try to contain my remarks to the committee amendment and I will try not to get away from that. The substantive issue is this, that Senator Lamb, by his amendment, has reverted the bill back to where it was prior to