

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

April 6, 2000

LB 914, 925

ago or whatever it was, time flies when you're having fun, inadvertently gave an extension, an additional extension of 12 months to that 2 years. What this amendment does is knocks that off and says, no, we're not going to extend welfare benefits to basically make it three years. So yes and no.

SENATOR RAIKES: And does this cost money?

SENATOR HILGERT: No.

SENATOR RAIKES: Or does this save money?

SENATOR HILGERT: It would save...it would certainly save \$1.5 million a year even if we allowed people to have that extension.

SENATOR RAIKES: So what you're telling me is this particular amendment would have no fiscal impact?

SENATOR HILGERT: No. It would have no fiscal impact because even after the 24 months we're still under the ADC transitional program or supplying day care. That would still be a savings to the state. So it would save \$1.5 million. The savings would still be there whether we grant the extension to the family or not.

SENATOR RAIKES: So why would we adopt this amendment if we're not going to...we're going to further restrict what a person would be entitled to and it's not going to save any money?

SENATOR HILGERT: This amendment itself that we're debating right here would not have a fiscal impact. It would not save any money. It does bring it back with the original statute. But you're right, it does away with the extension that I gave in my first amendment. Why we would do this, the only reason I'm presenting this is because I presented LB 914 as giving that woman the option of staying at home up to 12 months. What I inadvertently did was give an extension beyond the 2 years of 12 months so that 12 month wouldn't count on their 2-year time limit. And the only reason I'm introducing it, because I want to be honest and clear and consistent to my colleagues. I don't want to try to do anything by subterfuge so I felt duty bound to