

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

February 22, 2000 LB 717

danger, whatever it may be, in this case chemical spills, you can say to the people who are responsible for producing the product that causes the potential problem, you can say to them, because you do this, and in order to create the most incentives for you to be careful, we're establishing a fee system whereby the regulatory process will be funded. And, formerly, in earlier years and with respect to the federal government, that's been the general principle of operation, that is, fees on those who causes the problem, both because they are the cause of the problem and, secondly, because it creates incentives for them to be careful. In recent years, we've gotten away from that because what's happened is that whatever group causes the problem, they come in and fight about the fee, they don't want to be responsible. So time after time, what's happening in recent years is that we give up on the fight and say, okay, we'll do it with General Funds. And I'm going to start pointing these out time after time. It is something I don't think is the better public policy. And now, in this particular area, and I hate to be critical in any way because Senator Preister has done so much good work in this area and is trying to get something established that we really need, but here we are. He's brought us around to where we all recognize the need and now it's being held up because the people, the tier I people who produce all these hazardous chemicals don't want to be directly responsible for the regulatory program, and so, hence, the committee amendments solving the problem which is a solution to the problem but it's another reason why we're feeling so much pressure on state government these days. It's because we're starting to pick up things like this, too, as a part of the General Fund budget. Now I don't want to get sidetracked on another issue but there is a third item here that points out why our state budgets are becoming so high, and that is because we're picking up more and more local expenditures out of the state budget. Now one might argue that this ought to be a local expenditure. It has to do with the protection of the local communities in a very basic way. But we don't want that argument either. We're going to have a state appropriation and then we don't get in arguments with business, and we don't get any arguments about whether it's a local matter or not. So we can...we can do this today and maybe the argument isn't over. I don't know what Senator Preister's intentions are. Maybe he needs a little seed money today and we get it going and we renew