

they could retain down to the minimum, which is twelve-five rather than the 25,000. So, with that, we are in compliance with federal and yet we're not letting those people become relatively well to do, while someone else is taking care of the spouse, and those other someone else's that are taking care of the spouse are not as well off as those that we're supporting. So, Don, I just want to tell you ahead that that's what I think I'll probably be doing on Select. The other thing is I want to ask you a question. Someone asked, I think it was Senator Pirsch, regarding will the funds be there on the assets part of the LB. And I'm asking you if I did amend that bill, if I didn't amend the bill down to the twelve-five, would federal support be there in the amount, or are we going to be asked to pick up the difference in the state then? We would be asked to do that on our own, wouldn't we, so that the extra money we're talking about here, the difference in what they're mandating and what we have said we would do...

SENATOR WESELY: Oh, no, no.

SENATOR SMITH: ...we would be picking that difference up, wouldn't we?

SENATOR WESELY: No.

SENATOR SMITH: The feds will pick that up?

SENATOR WESELY: Yeah, well, but it's part of the...under the Medicaid program we have some flexibility under that. So, it's...

SENATOR SMITH: In other words, because our law is more than what they're saying as a minimum, double, actually, what they're saying as a minimum, that they will pay that difference?

SENATOR WESELY: No, it's just...it's part of the spend-down is all.

SENATOR SMITH: They'll reimburse...the feds will reimburse that...in other words, I guess maybe it's not the feds, it's that they'll spend down faster and they'll be on welfare faster because of the higher level that we allow. In other words, their assets still could be at their share, 25,000, and then the other spouse goes on welfare.