

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

March 14, 2006 LB 1060

are going to have the services in them, you know, how much is...how much are they going to be able to do? How many people are they going to be turning away? And, Senator Stuhr, you know, I understand that your area does not have any services there in those two cities the size of York and I forget the other...the other city, Seward. You know, the need is there. The need is throughout the whole state, and why should we concentrate that all in one area? We need to broaden this out so that everyone in the state has access to these programs. We are a state of under so many million people that we have...our resources are limited. I realize that. And heaven forbid, you know, when a tax comes up that we say we cannot tax this state anymore. No, we can't. There are people that are living on fixed incomes, on pensions. It's hard for them, very hard. But we also can't turn our back on those people who need these services the most. So I want you to be cautious. I would like to have you reconsider the last vote that was taken and sit down and weigh this out yourself. If not, I hope you would support the increase in funding that I have offered. Because if we're going to do this, we should do it right. I don't know whether the Governor will veto that. It all depends. But I wanted to have something before you to...so you can make your own judgment call and see what happens if we go forward with this. With that, thank you, Senator Cudaback.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Janssen. Senator Foley, your light is on, but you have spoken three times. I'm sorry. (Visitors introduced.) On with discussion. Senator Chambers. This will be your third time, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, Senator Janssen and others are giving Senator Foley credit that he's not entitled to. Senator Stuhr, poor Senator Stuhr, has not followed the wording of the amendment, because it does not mean that more service...that services will be spread over a wider area, but that entities can provide fewer services and still be funded. The purpose of Senator Foley's amendment is not to make services available to more women over a broader area, but to allow entities to be funded which will not provide a full range of services. That's what the issue is. And I know people are trying to be collegial and cordial with Senator