

to you as this is one of those instances where there was language in the bill earmarking the dollar amounts for this purpose which is the intern program that is in Lincoln. The...it's accurate to say that, as Senator Baack has indicated, that a number of those people do, fairly high percentage as a matter of fact, do end up in rural areas. It's also accurate to say that there are other family practice interns by the med school. I don't recall the percentage of those students off the top of my head. The reason this became an issue, up until this year, or last year, the three hospitals in Lincoln also contributed part of the funding and because of all the complications of Medicare, DRGs and all those things, combination of things, anyway, they have opted not to provide that funding as I recall and so for the program to continue either we put in some state funds or it was going to be closed as I understand it. The other side is that it will come out of the med center's budget somewhere as Senator Baack has indicated. And I only want to comment on this because there will be two or three other overrides that will also be, or maybe more than that, but there will be other overrides that has the same consideration that you want to weigh is that you will be eliminating something from funding whenever we do these and in cases there may be, you know, you may well feel there is justification, that's...you know, that's fine, but it's nothing different in this budget bill this year than the way it always is. If, in fact, we could anticipate vetoes, why you could string into the budget bill a whole series, make it many, many pages long, a whole series of separate items so that it would be easier to handle on vetoes. Historically, that just never has been done. I could think of once or twice where we intentionally structured bills in order to accomplish a variety of levels of vetoes. The one time I can remember it was on the state aid in 1980. But normally that's the problem when you have a lump sum appropriation to an agency, it's either all or none. Or if it's some earmarking in it, why your choice is to fund that but at the expense of something and you do not know what. That's the balance of explanation I would make, but Senator Baack I think has indicated very accurately where...what the issue is and I just wanted to add a little bit of background of why it came up as a budget issue in the first place.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Hall, please, followed by Senator Coordsen, then Senator Moore.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President, members, I rise in