

May 27, 1981

LB 487A

the part that I am amending will reinstate the appropriation bill as it was enacted by the Legislature. The two items that I would be changing back to the way the appropriation bill was enacted is that there was \$50,000 of cash funds that were authorized or appropriated to the Department of Agriculture as part of their export program together with language that it was the intent of the Legislature that these various checkoff programs would contribute those funds between them. It doesn't mandate that they do it. They wouldn't have to do anything if they didn't choose to do so. Personally, however, I am of the strong conviction that as one who pays checkoff funds, by the way, as all farmers do, that I am of the strong conviction that a portion of that checkoff funds is appropriate to be used to coordinate these various export functions which is the primary responsibility of the Department of Agriculture, the various trade fairs, those kinds of activities. They are primarily set up by them and I think it is quite appropriate that the various checkoff programs contribute some small amount to the total cost of the program for that activity. You may recall it is \$550,000 of general fund money that was added this year in addition to what was already spent for export in some small amount. It is only \$50,000 and I think it ought to stay available from these checkoff programs to be utilized in the Department of Ag. The other portion of the amendment that is proposed for this A bill would set a part the wheat development agency commission which as a result of LB 11 was permissive to have their own budget separate from the Department of Ag. What this amendment does is return that to the way it is now or keep it the way it is now where the budget for that agency is administered through the Department of Agriculture. LB 11, as I recall, made it permissive for this action but it does not require it. Had it required it, it would have been an A bill on LB 11 itself doing the same thing. I have a real deep concern if we start utilizing A bills to make general appropriation adjustments throughout state government. It would be an extremely bad precedent. You could certainly read the rule very clearly that A bills are intended only for the purpose of funding the enabling legislation and are not to be utilized as general appropriations bills and the obvious adverse precedent that would be established if those two amendments were allowed to stand I think are obvious. What would remain in the bill is the two items that has already been indicated, both of which are involved in A bills back on General File, so I can see some logic for them to stay and that is the \$40,000 for the pseudorabies, and then in addition, there is a substantial reduction in general fund money of \$142,000 net because of the increase in fees through the laboratories, and obviously, that is related

5889