

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

May 28, 2003

LB 48

perspective on this. I was unable to attend the meeting that the members of this body had with the Governor recently but am keenly interested in it and, in fact, fought hard on the floor of the Legislature to help the Rural Development Commission become a state agency, fought hard to keep it from not being dismantled or fought hard to keep it from being dismantled, but then last year reluctantly agreed to Senator Stuhr's provision that would really do away with the Rural Development Commission and allow it to become a nonprofit 501(3)(c). And I thought the reasoning was good at that time that we do it. Since that time, I've become very concerned and upset over the way this whole thing was handled. And I think I agree with Senator Chambers, I can't think of a better word than snookered, Senator Chambers, that fits the occasion. So I'm supportive of the idea of putting something back into statute. But, Senator Chambers, I'm not sure I like exactly either how your amendment to the amendment or your amendment are structured and I'm just going to offer up an idea or a suggestion, and then you can respond to it if we have time, or respond to it on your own time. The original language of statute was a little bit more flexible, perhaps, and a little bit more permissive. And I call your attention to page 2 of the amendment and the language that is deleted, first of all, says that the appointments may include representation from, and then it goes ahead and lists all those groups primarily that you have listed in your amendment, although I don't think you include "youth" in the amendment and maybe some others. I'm a little concerned that we are being too dictatorial about which groups will be represented on this commission; that we should perhaps suggest that they come from these arenas but not insist, because there may be good reasons for appointing other people to the board or to the commission. And then I like your language in your amendment to the amendment but I would, again, say entities representing such interests may each nominate one person for membership, rather than shall, and not make it an absolute. And then I think I would add towards the end of your amendment something to the effect that efforts would be made, again this would be going back to the existing statutory language or the language that was deleted, I guess, effort to balance representation based on blah-blah-blah, blah-blah, shall be made when making these appointments. Senator Chambers, would you be...would you have an reaction to