

May 20, 1981

LB 529A, 234, 389, 544, 561

CLERK: (Read record vote as found on page 2136 of the Legislative Journal.) 42 ayes, 4 nays, 1 excused and not voting, 2 present and not voting, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The bill is declared passed on Final Reading.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senators DeCamp and Maresh move to reconsider the body's action on failing to pass LB 234 yesterday.

Mr. President, Senator Kremer would like to print amendments to LB 544. (See page 2137 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, Senator Koch moves to override the Governor's line item veto of the state aid monies as set forth in LB 561.

Mr. President, I have a reference report from Senator Lamb referring a gubernatorial appointment for confirmation hearing.

Mr. President, that is all that I have, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Okay, are we ready for item #6? Senator Wesely, do you wish to be recognized on item #6? Okay.

SENATOR WESELY: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, there is a motion pending to return LB 389 from Final Reading to Select File for a specific amendment. That amendment is an amendment cosponsored by Senator Schmit and myself, the cosponsors of this bill to delay the operative date of this bill, LB 389, which provides for disabled family members to be served in their home. This program would be delayed until July 1, 1982. This would effectively eliminate the need for an A bill this year and this provision in this amendment is one which has been worked out in cooperation with the Welfare Department and with the budget office. I think you have on your desk a handout that was presented by me. It is a letter from John Knight to myself concerning LB 389 and his support for the concepts and aims of that legislation. He talks a bit about the Minnesota program. I would urge you to take a look at that. Also attached is a sheet showing some of the cost savings. There were questions before about, well, can you be more specific on cost savings on this program. The handout will give you some idea of where we can save money depending on the certain facilities we are talking about in providing that assistance. So I think it clearly is a program that has a lot of support. The concerns that were in the past was the fact that we just did not have the money this year with the budget as it was and so we are asking to delay implementation and, thus, not have any need for an A