

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

March 14, 2006 LB 1060

in Seward, Nebraska, no providers; and on and on, many other towns and villages, no providers. My amendment simply opens the door and offers the opportunity for other healthcare providers, if you're interested in providing these services to low-income women, here's a program you can operate with. And I think many of them will step forward, not all of them, not as many as I might like to see, but many of them will step forward and say, yes, we want to offer services, too, so the women in our community don't have to travel 91 miles for a Pap smear. They know that's crazy. They know we don't do that with other programs. We don't do that with the Every Woman Matters Program. Why do we do it here? Some of the senators are concerned about that language regarding the potential that some providers would only offer some of the services and not all, and I've explained that. The language is very clear as to why we're doing that. It says, if necessary for the availability of the services throughout the state. That's what we're trying to achieve here. There may be some provider out in rural Nebraska, some corner of the state, that says, look, we can do the Pap smears and the chlamydia tests, which by the way is where most of the money goes anyway, we can go that far with you, but if the patient needs something beyond that we're not going to be able to deliver it. We ought to do that. We ought to at least do that much because that's where most of the money is going anyway--Pap smears, chlamydia tests, and antibiotics if they test positive. They can do that and that's where the money is going. We ought to have them do that. If it gets to be a more severe case, cancer, whatever it might be, they're going to have to go to another provider, but at least we'll make an improvement,...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR FOLEY: ...a very big improvement in this program, if we do that. That language is absolutely important, and I've said to a number of senators I'm not opposed to the direction that Senator Janssen wants to take us. I am not opposed to that. I don't think that doubling is prudent. I think that doubling begs for a gubernatorial veto. I think that's a slam dunk. I think he's going to do that. I haven't talked to him about that, but I would guess that he would veto a doubling of the