

Mr. President, on LB 632 it was a bill that was introduced by Senator Vard Johnson, Senator Chambers and Senator Goodrich. (Title read.) The bill was read on January 22. It was referred to Public Health and Welfare for hearing. The bill was advanced to General File. There are committee amendments pending by Public Health and Welfare, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Wesely, the amendments.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, members, the amendments significantly change the fiscal impact of the bill and I'd call your attention to them. As the bill was originally introduced they would raise the ADC payment level from a \$280 figure to a minimum of \$400 which is a \$120 increase. This proposal was brought to us by Senators Johnson, Chambers and Goodrich. We did have a lengthy hearing and excellent testimony from those in support of the bill, but the concern of the committee was the cost implications of raising the ADC payments by that level and so the committee amendment would lower that \$400 level back down to \$300. Presently, as I said, the payment level is \$280, so we would go from \$280 to \$300. That's about a sixth of the cost of the bill as introduced so if you'll look at the fiscal note you can pretty well estimate the cost of the bill under the committee amendment as one-sixth of what you see on the fiscal note. The present standard of need figure in the statutes is \$293, but we only fund \$280 of that standard of need. Senator Johnson felt, and the committee agrees, that setting a standard of need at a reasonable level and then not funding it is not a good idea and so that is why the language is that at least that amount of money will be paid in ADC payments. This is to make sure that we don't raise the standard of need and not actually correspondingly increase the payments. So even though we have a \$293 standard of need we only pay \$280 so it is the \$280 figure that we will be raising as well as the \$293 figure to \$300 for both the standard of need and the payment level. The figure was arrived at by the committee after looking at other states and finding for instance Iowa had a \$305 payment and some other border states were in that ball park and so the feeling was that would not be an unreasonable increase and that is what the committee amendment would call for. I'd ask your support for the committee amendment.