

(start belt #5)

invested there and this is the final finishing up of a project that we already have money on and a project that serves all of Nebraska, not just that town, because it is owned by the state. so when you discuss these projects that they do serve the vast middle class who are paying the taxes. I oppose the opening up either the original budget or the capital construction budget. But once it was opened up I worked to then attach something that I thought was important. What we have done in this budget is move ahead some of the projects that would be coming in the next couple of years anyway. In short I think that we should move ahead and not return the bill and get the thing taken care of.

PRESIDENT: Senator Carpenter.

SENATOR CARPENTER: I'll pass.

PRESIDENT: Alright, Senator Nore.

SENATOR NORE: Mr. President, fellow members, I certainly am unhappy about anyone down grading the budget committee. I think that we have always had a good budget committee and most of the sessions that I have been in the budget committee and the appropriation has been accepted usually without, it has usually been accepted unanimously and many times without any amendments without any debate. I think that this budget committee that we have now is a good committee. They work hard and they have studied, they have planned and they thought and they have communicated and they have done a good job. I think that it is necessary to have a budget committee. This pork barrel operation out here in the floor is no good. We just can't have it. If we continue it we are either going to have to go to a two house system or go to a partisan legislature. This thing is getting out of hand. We are getting to much that doesn't pertain to the operation of the state of Nebraska.

PRESIDENT: Alright, Senator Stahmer.

SENATOR STAHMER: Mr. President, members of the body, I think that in a way that I should make one apology, because I think that the budget committee and I'll take as much blame as anyone and I'm not afraid to speak so perhaps I should take more blame. I don't think that we did a good job of explaining the process of how we appropriate money for buildings and I would like to especially Senator Luedtke who jumped me on this to listen if he would. OK, it is not the fact that we are against penal reform or that we are trying to hold it up Senator Luedtke, we have money in there for planning but if I can explain this to you with your undivided attention perhaps you can grasp it. Once we adopt an amendment such as yours we do not then have the prerogative of changing the amount more or less for a building. Once we adopt a resolution such as yours we are wetted to a certain plan and the legislature looses all input into it. It isn't that we are trying to stull these things and see whether we need them or do not need them, it is when you come on this fllor and say that we are going to have 10 million for a building or 5 million for a building, we don't know whether we really need 5 or whether we could get by with 4 or whether we would be better off with 6 or 7. That is what you are doing when you leap frog this all into one appropriation. If you are trying to say that the budget committee is against all of these things, I think that this is incorrect, but we do have a procedure, most of which the legislature does not understand. The first step in the three year building assessment is