

answer most of these concerns, not necessarily in the order of importance or because I like one member of the Appropriations Committee better than another, but as I can think of them in order. Senator Scofield read from this document. This document is wrong. This document is right. I'm not going to take the time to read, because I'm on my time. All of these things where it said the county has sole responsibility, operates in a different kind of standards and state laws than we operate from in Nebraska. There are, in fact, only four states in the country, four states that mandate the counties pay any part at all of the indigent health care issue, and I'll get into more detail, if we have to. Secondly, as far as the trade-off is concerned, I do understand, and you folks should understand as well whenever an agency of state government comes into the Appropriations Committee with the recommendation, like they did, in this case for a Medicaid readjustment, funds to be matched with federal funds and then changing the formula for reimbursement for the docs, that doesn't come before the Health and Human Services Committee, obviously. It only goes to Appropriations. But, quickly, I want to point out that's one of the problems with the system, you see. At the same time, in Health and Human Services we were talking about indigent care, the Appropriations Committee was talking about a trade-off already and it's in the trailer bill, and we didn't know anything about it. I didn't try to create this problem or cause it, believe me. And I don't want to cause anybody any misery, I support LB 525. But remember that, remember that, and that can happen to any standing committee. As far as the kick in, the kick-in in 1990 and '91, is intentional. We never did intend to fund LB 187 in 1989-90, because we were told by the Department of Social Services it would take at least a year to gear up to administer this kind of legislation. Secondly, as far as the...again, as far as the concern is about regarding the problem with some constitutionality, everything in this bill addresses the same subject, indigent care. Now the numbers change because, obviously, we went from 12 million to 7.2. I'm not a lawyer, again, but I don't think that that should be a problem. I understand maybe the dilemma and frustration of the Appropriations Committee, but this is probably as good an example as we had for years around here where what we're doing in one building, part of the building at the same time we're doing something else in another part of the building, we're both trying to do the same thing and the whole problem becomes complicated. What we simply did with this, and, by the way, I also want to correct something. I understand with the amendment