

May 9, 1995

LB 642

SENATOR HALL: Explain that one to me.

SENATOR AVERY: We have a very complex system there,...

SENATOR HALL: I guess so.

SENATOR AVERY: ...and we have children that are...should be our most important...(interruption)

SENATOR HALL: I absolutely agree with that.

SENATOR AVERY: So what we need to do is have that transfer, that over time we don't...we have a safety net there to catch, but the...

SENATOR HALL: (Interruption).

SENATOR AVERY: ...other reviewers would be on the ball.

SENATOR HALL: The question is, then, if DSS is going to phase out 11 1/2 and we are only going to put 5 in under this proposal in the first year, what happens to those other 6 1/2, and would the net cover only half of the problem or half of the space that the kids may fall into, and those that just are lucky enough to hit the net, great; those that don't are phased out till those other 5 employees come in? How does it work? How is the system going to work, and do we actually know? Even though I guess I can go ask DSS this, do we actually know if those 11 1/2 employees are going to be phased out? I don't see that in I guess the fiscal note. When I look at it, and maybe I am not looking at it correctly, but I'm not sure, under the appropriations bill that follows this, the A bill, that there is a reduction that correlates, maybe there is, that correlates directly with Department of Social Services that reflects the 11 1/2 employees that we're talking about, and I...and why does that, I guess, pertain to Senator Schimek's amendment because if we are not necessarily talking about transferring those same employees, and the question is do we...I guess the first question you have to ask, do you want to transfer those employees? If the argument is the system that exists in DSS is so bad, so god-awful, then why would we want to, I guess, inject it...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.