

January 7, 1976

you release a child from a state institution such as the Boys Training Center at Kearney, the present law would strip that child or that young person of all of his money down to \$750. Institutions asked for \$1500 and that is absolutely ridiculously too low. There is no reason to make paupers out of these young people or these children after they have "paid their debt to society", but now remember that if they are released to somebody that is legally responsible, they are legally responsible, not the child.

SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY: I have some concern about the comment and the fiscal impact which indicates that setting up this amount at \$5000 we are going to preclude the state receiving funds under the Title 19 Program, and I wonder, further, what institutions specifically we are talking about. Senator Kelly refers to having paid their debt and I had an idea this institution included other than correctional institutions and that the state had a pretty good exposure annually in order to compensate these people and further how many of these people are going to be affected by this. How many of these people do we have in there with assets in excess of \$1500? Are we going to deprive the state of federal support under these medical programs for the entire time this child is a ward of the state in order to accomplish a \$1500 support at the end, and like I say, is it going to be 1 out of 10, 1 out of 20. How many wealthy people do we have in our institutions?

SPEAKER: Senator Murphy raises many questions. Does anyone care to respond to the questions submitted by Senator Murphy? Seeing none, the questions go unanswered, sir. Any further discussion? Senator Barnett.

SENATOR BARNETT: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I think it is obvious that some of the people in this body have never been to the Nebraska Home for Children and Youth and maybe do not understand how those children are put there. It's obvious that some of the children that could be there could be without parents and would have assets from an estate. It is obvious that there are a lot of people there, a lot of children there that cannot afford and would not have any assets. I assume this bill refers to just the ones that do. I think that is what Senator Kennedy and Senator Fowler tried to get across. I, myself, have not heard of the problem out there but I know that it says in here that the Nebraska Committee or the Home or the Superintendent of the Home shall take over the responsibility of these assets to see that they are handled properly. Now is that proper, Senator Kennedy? Is that a good interpretation. And I have one other question while we are at it. It says the superintendent shall oversee assets up to a certain amount of money, deposit them in a bank, if they so desire and so forth. Is it proper language now to have that as the Superintendent of the Nebraska Home for Children and Youth because that Department has been transferred under the Welfare Department under the direction