

April 7, 1982

LB 602

the residency or legal settlement requirement for eligibility for public assistance from the state and for medical services furnished by the county. The Welfare Department can still do this. They establish it, so why put it in there, the year, six months or anything else? Let's just take it out and leave it. Now I am pretty sure Vard has a legal answer for that too, but to come up here at this late hour with this sort of stuff let's just take it out and leave it alone.

SENATOR LAMB: Senator Vard Johnson on the Haberman amendment to the amendment.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, this is one time I really don't have a legal answer to that question. I just have a policy reason. Now the policy reason is this, the only reason that you still give the Department of Public Welfare the ability to establish residency or settlement requirements is because this is a charge to be born by counties, and so you really have to know to what county the charge should be born. If you have somebody, for example, that lives in Gosper County, falls ill and moves to Douglas County, if there is not any kind of a legal settlement requirement, then because they are being treated in Douglas County, Douglas County could be paying the expense as opposed to Gosper County, or to Kearney County or what have you. Or by the same token, if you have somebody living in Douglas County and heaven forbid they thought they needed some medical services in Gosper County, in the absence of any kind of legal settlement requirements Gosper County would pay the freight. So what you do is you have to give the Welfare Department the ability to establish a legal settlement standard. We have it in the existing law, but...that's right. So you have...you give them the ability to establish a standard but you want to make certain that whatever the standard is it doesn't exceed an unreasonable period of time and that is where the one year comes from. And we have had the one year concept in the old Poor Law for a long period of time. So that is why the second sentence, the one that Senator Haberman wishes to strike, is an important sentence. It just can't exceed a one year residency or legal settlement requirement. So it is a policy issue on that one, Senator Haberman, not a legal question. And I think what you want to do is not very good policy, and what I want to do is superb policy, and for that reason, Senator Haberman, I would hope this body would repudiate that amendment.

SENATOR LAMB: Senator Vickers.