

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

April 19, 1999 LB 637

kinds of contracts, but there is concern on many different people's parts about whether there should be privatization. There are some people who want privatization; there are others who don't want the option of privatization. They believe that this is a government function and must be kept with the government. So this amendment would require that the contract be with the State Treasurer and it requires it in language that is consistent with the federal legislation, but it does...it is limiting in the sense that there would not be an RFP developed in the same way, that it would be under the legislation as originally introduced, and there would not be any option of contracting with one of the counties that is currently working on it. There would not be the option of contracting with a private employer. But because I knew that this issue was going to come up and because I knew that the State Treasurer has been working this issue a great deal, I wanted to bring forth an amendment that...so we could have the discussion on the amendment, but the amendment was drafted in a way that it was consistent with federal legislation. Because it does not make much sense to...for me to go through the difficulty in getting this bill passed and have some amendment that is not consistent with the federal law and still puts us out of compliance and so we still are in a position of being...receiving sanctions as a result. So I...I am here to answer questions about this amendment. I...I, at this point, would prefer to keep our options as wide open as possible, so I actually prefer the legislation as it was originally introduced, because it allows for the most options. But if the...if the body would prefer to have the...require that the Treasurer be the one that handles it then I want...I want it to be...I want the amendment to be done in a way that is consistent with the federal legislation. And so I...I...the other thing that I would say is that I feel very strongly that this...that these funds are the funds of the families, and one of the important aspects about the federal legislation that underlies LB 637 is that it requires a two-day turn around from the receipting of the money to the disbursing of the money, and our current system can be that quick, but often is not, and this requires that it be quick. And so there is a...there's a resistance on my part to some of the discussion that has gone around this amendment that...that it is the state's money or it is the county's money, that we have to keep it in banks in the county or we have to draw interest on it at