

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

March 14, 2006

LB 1060

Nelson, who is, if you watch what his record has been on these issues, it has been pro-life. And what it was...what was happening is women were presenting at these clinics, that there already was an existing contract, with other issues. And a decision was made in the Appropriations Committee, and it came to the floor and the Legislature approved it, to be able to provide an additional service, an additional set of services, something that was very much needed. I'm just baffled by the fact that instead of continuing those services that have been going on, that women in the community I live in and the larger metropolitan areas that run out of money within this program in the current year, why we would instead dismantle that, and not add more funds and open it to other people throughout the state. I don't have any objection to that at all, and if that had come through as an appropriation request I would have been very supportive of that. So what we're being asked to do is to dilute what's already out there, thin that down, take away the good programming that I've never heard any complaints about, that's already in place--the equipment is there, the procedures are there, it's rolling, the people in the community are aware of it, referrals are made--somehow dilute that process for clearly another agenda. Let's just be realistic about it. You can dance all around it all you want this morning, but we know who is supporting the bill, we know who's lobbying the bill, and it isn't to...because we want to do better contracting at the state level. It's to take away from organizations that provide family planning, that are a very important part of what happens in our communities. So let's instead let that stay the way it has for the last eight years, so that when women present at those locations, they can get this additional help that they need, and add to that, so that you can expand that service throughout the state. This, to me, is poor public policy. We have a critical problem with this type of disease, and this need for this prevention for women. Don't take it away from women just because they happen to live in Omaha or Lincoln and there's some other political agenda. What we should be doing is expanding the program to serve other areas, and let other providers do that. But don't destroy what you've already got in place that works well. In my view, this bill should have come to the Appropriations Committee for an additional appropriation. That's what we're talking about, and I don't think there's