April 3, 2006   LB 1248

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...when it's going to cost money to keep them around and they are not going to contribute anything of significance?

SENATOR BAKER: One minute.

SENATOR JENSEN: That...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Answer this question. Forgetting all of the sentimentality, if the aged were removed, money would be saved and could be expended on these other groups. Isn't that true? Whether you like it or not, that would be true, wouldn't it?

SENATOR JENSEN: Medicaid was established for the aged, the disabled, and the young.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But we're not sticking to all of that. We're changing now. We cannot sustain that. That is the language in here. I'm...when I talk about something very concrete, you want to go back to the original intent, but you don't want to deal with what I'm talking about which flows from the language in your amendment. Should old people have a lower priority than pregnant women? Can you at least concede that?

SENATOR JENSEN: No.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Should they have a higher priority than pregnant women?

SENATOR JENSEN: They should have the same priority.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Then you don't have a priority, do you? When everything is on the same level, there's no priority, isn't it? Doesn't priority mean...

SENATOR BAKER: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...putting something ahead of something else?

SENATOR JENSEN: Yes, it does.