

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Madam President, and members, I'm against the Bernard-Stevens amendment just because I'd like my amendment to stay intact. I do appreciate his bringing it and talking about it because I understand what he's saying. And, as far as the date and so on are concerned, that's exactly what I want to do is delay the implementation of LB 455. And I didn't know it had the E clause on it and I'm sorry to hear that because I was hoping that it wouldn't go into effect until September and then maybe I could get it stopped a little further. But Senator Dave Maurstad asked a question and I want to touch on that just for a minute too because I do have another amendment that I call the unfunded mandates amendment, and that is the one that asks for a study to tell us what impact it will have on counties, municipalities and other sub...other legal subdivisions, because we need to know that, that's very pertinent to this bill. And Senator Hall's amendment the other day, you all thought that was great, don't let it go back to the counties, you voted for that. I under...I know there's a task force in here, in the bill to study and evaluate but I don't...I don't trust that task force anymore than I did the original one. Most of us, who were not tuned to what the leaders of that committee wanted, were left out completely. We were not allowed to have any kind of influence on it at all and people who were there who didn't agree with it were left out. The other thing about the Health and Human Services Committee, so what, they voted seven nothing not to put it out, they just weren't thinking as far as I'm concerned. They just didn't want to be bothered with it. They want the bill. It's on a fast track. They don't want it to be slowed down. They want it to go. My other point I want to make right now is that one of my questions eventually of Senator Bohlke, and Senator Witek touched on this too, how much is this going to cost us. From the very beginning, the image that's being painted by welfare reform from Washington, D.C., and filtering down into the states, the idea is that it's going to save us an enormous amount of money. That is not true. It's not going to lower your property taxes. It's not going to save a lot of money. You still have to serve the people out there who need the services. And what I'm talking about in this amendment is that we have to realize that there are private providers who are going to have a problem if we take all these people off in one fell swoop and then...and maybe it won't happen the day after the bill is passed, but it will happen fairly quickly if these people who are serious about that, and if it doesn't, well, then we'll just say, well, why did you want it? You're not doing it. So they will be working