

March 27, 1980

LB 647

SENATOR CLARK: The question before the House is the adoption of the Beutler amendment to the amendment. It takes a simple majority of those voting. Have you all voted? Record the vote.

CLERK: 18 ayes, 1 nay, Mr. President, on adoption of Senator Beutler's amendment.

SENATOR CLARK: The amendment is adopted. You have another amendment on the desk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Newell moves to amend the Labeledz amendment. (Read the Newell amendment as found on page 1582 of the Legislative Journal.)

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Newell.

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President and members of the body, I know that this is an election year and it is the year that we are supposed to be giving away things, and I would do that if I didn't think this whole thing might be in jeopardy of maybe costing too much, and so I offer this amendment. This amendment says that this qualifier instead of being a \$40,000 home will be a \$32,000 home. Now, two years ago we increased from 15 to 25, and this year we will increase another \$12,000 because of the reevaluation. Now, one of the things that...one of the reasons I am offering this amendment is simply this, that we don't have unlimited dollars and since our present system does not really aim at getting a clear picture of need...in other words we don't really do the income tests. We do a very general income test which we call adjusted gross, that the only way we can disqualify people in our present system is by saying, you only get so much off on your house. Now to some extent that is a good disqualifier because you know if you are poor and you are in need you sometimes have to have a house. However, and that house generally is not the most expensive house in the country. \$32,000 is going to exempt most of the people with older homes, but those elderly that moved into newer homes are not going to be exempted to the full extent that 40,000 is. I personally favored the circuit breaker approach which is a bill coming up after this, but I am going to support this bill also because one of these two bills has to pass. But if this bill is to pass, I think we have to be mindful of the cost. Now just briefly, our present systems costs about \$28,000,000. The bill the way it is written right now will cost approximately 42 million. And so what we do with this amendment is we cut out about \$6,000,000 by limiting how much of a home you can