

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

April 10, 2002 LB 1309

it, how are we in any different position this afternoon than we were yesterday afternoon as far as the revenue package we were talking about yesterday has been passed today? We could go back, if we wanted to, and accept the original proposal of the committee,...

**SPEAKER KRISTENSEN:** One minute.

**SENATOR SCHIMEK:** ...of the Appropriations Committee, if we would be committed to hanging in there for a veto override on the revenue bill. And I don't know if the...if there is anybody interested in doing that, but I certainly am and I certainly would encourage you all to think about it. There are a number of issues here that I think are very important. If you don't want to go back and totally take it back to what the Appropriations Committee had yesterday then, okay, be selective; take some of the programs back. They didn't want to do all this stuff last night. They only did it because you told them we weren't going to be able to get a revenue bill passed. Well, think about it. Think about it.

**SPEAKER KRISTENSEN:** Senator Connealy.

**SENATOR CONNEALY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members, I rise in support of Senator Stuhr's amendment. We've heard that, you know, there was no rural-urban discussion in the Appropriations Committee. I know there wasn't. But when you go through the programs and work through them and check off and on and the like and then you end up with a package at the end, well, you have to look at that package and the product of that, even though there was no rural-urban discussion or not, we cut a tremendous amount from what we do in rural economic development, what we do for rural communities. If you look at LB 1348 is gone. If you look at animal damage and you look at statistics, those are all gone. You look at the package and it looks like a package that the rural areas are hurt, so I think that we need to look at the package as a whole now and say what kind of flavor do we want if we're going to override a package of programs for the state. And so, because of that, I've come to the realization that if I'm going to support a package it's going to have to look like a better rounded package. I have an amendment that comes up next