Carruthers moved that further proceedings of the roll call be suspended and that the Sergeant at Arms be instructed to bring in the absentees. The motion prevailed and it was so ordered.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

The following communication was received:

STATE OF MINNESOTA
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
SAINT PAUL 55155

March 26, 1996

The Honorable Irv Anderson
Speaker of the House of Representatives
The State of Minnesota

Dear Speaker Anderson:

I have vetoed and am returning House File No. 2818, Chapter 393, the Omnibus Health and Human Services appropriations bill.

In 1992 Minnesota enacted a bi-partisan health care reform package. As the result of our efforts, Minnesota has become the lead state in the nation in terms of creating meaningful health care reform which insures both quality care and careful use of taxpayer dollars.

We must never lose sight of these goals as we balance the demands of our growing Medicaid expenditures against federal budget reforms and our own budget constraints. We must continue to aggressively manage a public health care system which is projected to consume the entire state budget in the next 20 years.

Most regretfully, the legislation before me moves us in an opposite direction and clearly retreats from some of the progress we have made due to our efforts. In fact, this bill has no central philosophy and diminishes the efficiency of the state's purchasing power of public health care programs.

This legislation creates four significant setbacks for the consumer and the taxpayer:

* We asked the 1996 Legislature to expand managed care to cover all Minnesota families and children who receive health care paid for by tax dollars. With such a large group of health care consumers, we could expect a great deal of competition among providers which would result in the highest quality of care for our most vulnerable citizens. Instead, this bill suggests that we should fragment our purchasing power across county demonstration projects. Counties would be given state and federal tax dollars but would not face any local financial risk, thus substantially weakening accountability.
We asked for comprehensive pilots to find cost-efficient methods to serve the elderly and disabled. While we acknowledge a county role in this process, this bill again creates a dysfunctional system, giving state and federal health care dollars to the counties for demonstration programs with no financial risk borne by the counties. We cannot give a blank check to local governments to run our public health care system and expect efficiency.

We asked for significant investments in medical education and research targeted at providing primary care physicians desperately needed in rural Minnesota and to improve the infrastructure of the medical technology industry. This request was ignored.

We proposed a framework for the integration of all our public health care programs, and the Legislature chose to reject this framework which is vital to Minnesota's success in managing federal Medicaid reductions and avoiding drastic reductions in the number of people served.

At a minimum, this legislation creates a fiscal tail of over $40 million in the next biennium. And the opportunity costs of reversing these reforms could well approach the hundreds of millions of dollars, lost over the next several years.

Frankly, this short-term strategy points directly to long-term failure. The development of public policy should not be held hostage by small groups representing narrow interests.

I do support corrections to the personal care attendant and TEFRA programs and will accept language concerning long-term care facilities. There is ample time for the legislature to make these corrections in a different bill that will reach my desk.

I look forward to receiving the correction language, but I must reject this bill in its entirety based on many flaws and misdirections that we must not undertake at this time.

Warmest regards,

Arne H. Carlson
Governor

Carruthers moved that H. F. No. 2818 be now reconsidered and repassed, the objections of the Governor notwithstanding, pursuant to Article IV, Section 23, of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota.

A roll call was requested and properly seconded.

The question was taken on the motion to reconsider and repass H. F. No. 2818, the objections of the Governor notwithstanding, pursuant to Article IV, Section 23, of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota and the roll was called. There were 87 yeas and 47 nays as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson, B.  Dauner, Huntley, Leighton, Olson, E.
Anderson, R.  Dawkins, Jaros, Lieder, Ornen
Bekk, Delmont  Jefferson, Long, Opatz
Bertman, Dorn  Jennings, Lourey, Orenstein
Boudreau, Entenza  Johnson, A., Orfield, Oskopp
Brown, Farrell  Johnson, R., Mariani, Osthoff
Broecker, Finseth  Kahn, Marko, Ostrov
Brown, Garcia  Lalk, Ostrom, Seagren
Carlson, L.  Greenfield, Kelley, Schumacher
Carlson, S.  Greiling, Kelso, Seeger
Carruthers,  Hasskamp, Kinkel, Skoglund
Clark, Harder  Knight, Minter, Tomassoni
Cooper, Hausman  Larsen, Munger, Tompkins
Daggett