

and where your options do not lie and that the total cost of the full program will be before you. But, at this point, it's proper to move the bill because parts of this there is no question. We were having a bill drafted that stayed with just the absolute minimum things that could be done. But there is no reason, I suspect, that it couldn't be done through this bill, so you could consider it. But, in any event, I guess the bottom line I'm trying to say is there is a lot more to this whole act than just what we're dealing with today that we will be dealing with, but the other major costs do not have any statutory requirement. It's just a matter of how much of the money that you have to put in.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Thank you, Senator Warner. Is there any further discussion on the advancement of LB 362A? Evidently not. Senator Wesely, would you like to close on the advancement?

SENATOR WESELY: Yes, thank you. And I've tried to explain the issue as much as I can, and, obviously, many questions remain. But for Senator Smith's benefit and for Senator Warner's, the one and only difference between the mandates and this legislation is the minimums involved, the 12,000 versus the 25,000. I've tried to make that as clear as I can. The reason the 25,000 is in there is because last year the bill we passed said half of your assets up to 25,000. But, unfortunately, many people interpreted that to mean you could keep \$25,000. So, frankly, since the bill passed last year I kept getting calls from colleagues who said they had somebody in their district who had this situation come up and they thought they could keep 25,000. Why aren't they able to keep 25,000? And so Senator Withem and I, as we drafted the bill, thought that it seemed like maybe people weren't sure about the intent involved, so we put it at 25,000 as what you could keep, half your assets or 25,000, whichever is, I guess, less. So we ended up with that attitude. I don't have any problem with lowering it down to 12,000, frankly, that's the minimum and that's kind of what the original bill did. But we were trying to recognize that we had some colleagues that had a problem with some people, and that is why it's in the form that it is. I don't think you'll find the 12 or \$25,000 issue to really be that costly. I think we have to identify and pull that out, and Senator Warner is going to do that. But, obviously, that is a point of discussion and the one and only question that we have to resolve in this issue. Otherwise we've got to move forward, and I'd ask that the bill