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

March 15, 2006 LB 1060

of more long term, and I'm in favor of a long-term deal if it works out. But I don't want to come back in a year from now and have to come here on the floor and say, you know, my health department, you know, had to quit doing the service because they could not afford to do it anymore. That's what I do not want to happen next year, and that's one of my concerns. So I'm really cautious, you know, and very concerned as to what we're doing. If we're only going to do it for just a transfusion, just give them another bag of oxygen to live on for another year, or are we really going to do something that is meaningful to the people, to the women, to the health of the women? We should be looking at that. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Stuthman. Senator Preister, followed by Senator Brown.

SENATOR PREISTER: Thank you, Honorable President, friends all. Senator Stuthman, to a drowning person, even a breath of fresh air helps. Everything is better...anything better than nothing. listened yesterday to the Speaker and, as usual, he was eloquent, he was on point, and he gave very valuable information about the budget and about the process. And I listened and I heard those words and I said to myself, right on, Mr. Speaker. That was part of my decision making on this bill and on the amendment. I'm going to support the amendment that Senator Janssen has proposed. I don't think that \$200...and I believe it's not really \$250,000, it's \$231,000 that we're adding--is really enough, and the reason that I say that, and part of the other reason that I support this, is because we don't really run out of these funds, I found out. As the funds get reduced, the providers get less money, and they keep getting less money and they keep getting less money until they could conceivably get a penny for these services that they're providing. But a part of their contract, as it's explained to me from Chris Peterson, and I hope I'm repeating it accurately, is that as the funds go down the amount of payment just continually gets decreased, and it keeps getting decreased, and decreased. So by the end of the year, yes, the fund may not have run out, but it could be so nearly depleted that the providers get virtually nothing anyway. That's a concern to me. It's a concern to me because of a third reason that I'm going to support this amendment, and that third