

May 27, 1981

LB 39

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Kahle would move that LB 39 become law notwithstanding the actions of the Governor.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The Chair recognizes Senator Kahle.

SENATOR KAHLE: Mr. Speaker and members, first of all, I want to establish my credibility on this subject. LB 39 is not the first time we have had this issue before us. Senator Goodrich and myself sponsored I believe 177 two years ago, and as to establish my credibility, I did serve on a county board in Kearney County for eight years and served on the Welfare Committee Board that goes along with that job so I understand what the medical vendor payments are and what they mean to a county. First of all, I want to draw your attention to how 39 progressed in its path through the Legislature this year and on Select File the vote was 36 to 10 for 39 and 39A it was 37 to 10, picking up one vote. So this gave me encouragement to think about overriding the Governor's veto and it will be interesting to see how the vote turns out today. I am not threatening anybody, of course, but it will be interesting to see how deep the political implications are in this nonpolitical body. The Governor's message on the veto was kind of interesting, and in the second part of the paragraph, it says the provisions would increase the General Fund cost of the Medicare program approximately \$2.4 million. "As I have stated many times recently, with the current downturn in state revenues, it is neither prudent nor appropriate to embark on a new or expanded program at this time". Well, I hardly think the medical vendor payments are a new program and I want to establish this right now that no matter whether the state picks this up, this \$2.4 million, or whether it is picked up from property tax at the county level, it is going to be paid, as no money can be saved. It is a billing that will take place. It is all set. There is no way you are going to save any money. The only thing you are going to do is to determine whether it comes out of the state income tax or whether it comes out of the property tax. This business of talking about saving money or expanding programs is baloney. Now I want to get back to my pet peeve and I don't know how many of you agree with me on this but I am going to bring it up one more time anyhow and that is the fact that we roused the local subdivisions of government when we refunded the seventy million dollars out of an approximately two million dollars in interest and I know that many of you've said, "Well, this money is all spent" and all that kind of poppycock, but if you will look at the backside of today's agenda at the amount of money that was on hand, it was back in November I