

October 30, 1981

stitutional prerogatives we have and understand the Governor has certain powers and that is to call us into a session and he can set the parameters on that as far as the topics but within those topics each of us may have ideas and solutions that I think certainly should be considered. I would oppose Senator DeCamp's motion. I think it is far too limiting and is unnecessary.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Vard Johnson.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. President, members of the body, in first looking at the rule or the proposed rule change I was sympathetic but I then recognized that there is another aspect that has not been discussed this morning which causes me not to be in sympathy with the proposed change and that is this. If you read the newspaper you will notice that our Governor has said that he himself is required effectively to amend this call so that we not only discuss the budget but in addition we have to affect some substantive changes in some of our Human Services Programs because those substantive changes, in effect, are required by congressional legislation. As you may recall the new federal law is this. The states under some block grant programs and some categorical grant programs are to affect changes in their state structures by October 1, 1981, provided, however, if those changes require statutory change, then they are to affect those changes by the end of the next legislative session after October 1, 1981. It now turns out that this special legislative session is one of those legislative sessions that was contemplated by Congress. Consequently we will not only be considering budget bills, but in addition we will be considering substantive law. One such change that was discussed in the newspaper this morning was the fact that Congress says we have to roll back ADC payments for youngsters who are in school and who are between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one, and as I was driving down to Lincoln this morning I was thinking about that and I was thinking that by and large, the difficulty that works against poor people attempting to complete their high school programs and attempting to go on and benefit themselves and our society in general and I was wondering how to handle that. I haven't framed a full conclusion but it could well be that when we deal with that federal change, we might at the same token come back with a special education component to deal with low income people which would require a separate bill which could not be done simply by an amendment to the statutory change. Now there will be other substantive law issues that we will have to take up literally to meet the congressional mandate that we do