

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

March 23, 2006 LB 1060

call vote. (Laughter)

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Landis. I can't say we appreciate that. Record please, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 4 ayes, 17 nays, Mr. President, on the amendment.

SENATOR CUDABACK: The Landis amendment was not adopted.

CLERK: Mr. President, the next amendment I have is by Senator Don Pederson, AM2699. I do have a request from Senator Pederson to withdraw AM2699 and offer, as a substitute therefor, AM2855.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Any objection? So ordered.

CLERK: Senator Pederson, AM2855. (Legislative Journal page 1141.)

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Pederson, to open on your motion, AM2855.

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, this is a one-line amendment. Seems like one line is kind of inadequate considering all of the conversation we had about this proposal last week. We spent nearly two days talking about an amendment that was brought to us by Senator Foley, and Senator Foley's amendment, you will recall quite vividly, had to do with the matter involving funding for women's health matters. There were some concerns about that, that were expressed on the floor. There were a lot of matters that were brought up that, frankly, I don't think made us look very good as a Legislature. I think that what we did was we advanced an amendment that changed the structural method of determining how funding would take place as far as women's healthcare was concerned. Then we added money to it and many people were semi-confused, I'd say more than semi-confused, as to just exactly what was being accomplished by that, because what...the thought was that they were going to be bringing more healthcare to the women of our state, which is an admirable result. But it had a zinger in it, and that was the proposal that had been made by Senator Foley, and that created a lot of concerns about what would not be funded, what could not