

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR WILL: And the language is intentionally general in nature, because I think that the intent of the drafting of the amendment is let's try and catch anyone who may be, as a result of LB 1224, ineligible at the state level and then fall down to the county level.

SENATOR HALL: But it wouldn't be the intent of the amendment to have the county pay less under their current obligations. In other words, they wouldn't want to, under the amendment, limit the folks that they are responsible for right now, is that not correct?

SENATOR WILL: No, as far as I'm concerned, and I believe the amendment reflects that, this would not intend to be a narrowing of the responsibilities of the county that they currently have.

SENATOR HALL: Because I think that was one of the concerns that...well, I know it was one of the concerns that Senator Rasmussen and I were talking about, and I don't know if you're going to...I just...I think that needs to be clarified for purposes, because I'm not sure at all the first half of the amendment is necessary if there's no change in the Medicaid provisions, that the medical aspect or the medical services side from the county could fall off, and I think there needs to be some clarification, I would agree, so that it's clear, at least for intent purposes, that the...there would be no additional burden placed on the county for general assistance.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Time.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Hall. Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Madam President. I rise in opposition to Senator Will's amendment, although I understand the concern he's expressing. My hope is that Senator Will will withdraw the amendment, but he is raising a key point, what is the county role in all of this? And I think that's a very legitimate concern. I remember back about 12 years, 14 years ago we started talking about the idea of a state takeover of welfare offices. We did take that step, we took it away from