

the state doing it, although I could make them a good argument why it should remain at the county level as far as some of the controls are concerned.

SENATOR VICKERS: Okay, thank you, Senator Kahle. I appreciate those answers. The whole subject of LB 522 brings up some philosophical questions that I think we all need to answer and I think I will save my remarks to the bill itself later on. Thank you.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Nichol.

SENATOR NICHOL: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, this is a big bill. Let's not skim over it lightly. What has been said for the most part is true. Senator Cullan made some points that many times the county commissioners are not qualified to call the shots. Secondly, whoever pays the fiddler calls the tune and this is exactly what happens in the welfare proceedings. When county commissioners do attempt to infringe on rules and regulations as set out by the federal government, they usually get in trouble and that includes my area as well as most of yours. So there is a lot to say for this bill. However, as far as Senator Kahle's amendment is concerned, I think we ought to get this settled before we start so that the counties know where they are, and if we are going to dictate to the counties you pay part of these medical programs without anything to say about it, without even having perhaps a county welfare director, which you probably would not have under this new bill, then they are just paying for something over which they have no control at all and that isn't fair. Now we have been talking the last couple of days about fairness, so let's face that fairness situation right now before we go a little further with this bill. It is fine. I think I approve of the concept. For a long time we have been saying that the county commissioners don't have anything to say about it anyway but let's get this money situation straightened out right from the beginning so that they know where they stand and we know where they stand, and if we want to say we will handle it on the state level, then lets us pay the bill. So with that, I would say let's face Senator Kahle's amendment now because we are going to have to face it sooner or later anyway and the bill, I would think, would have a much better chance sailing along with Senator Kahle's amendment on it than without. Senator Vard Johnson, would you answer one question please. We are supposed to be in contact with the Appropriations Committee when we come up with something of any size at all and this certainly is some size at all, and I wonder if you have visited with the Appropriations Committee on this situation that we are talking about, the