

March 24, 1982

LB 761

the reason for the introduction of this amendment is to clarify an action which either did not take place or was delayed on LB 942 when I was absent yesterday. I had an amendment to 942 which would have stricken Sections 2 through 6 and would have stricken Section 14 of that bill. The reason for that was that I do not believe nor have I found very many persons who are affected to believe that it should be the duty of this Legislature to appropriate to the Department of Agriculture funds from the various commodity checkoff programs for the purpose of providing funds for the marketing division of the Department of Agriculture. I have discussed it with the checkoff boards, all four of them. I have discussed it with Mr. Bert Garvin, the Director of Agriculture. Mr. Garvin assures me that he prefers to make his proposal to the individual boards on a project by project basis if he desires funds for a project within the Department of Agriculture. Now since those sections have not been removed from 942, I have been told by several members of this body that it is expected that the funds will be contributed voluntarily. I want to assure the body that the boards have told me they will consider each and every proposal that is made to them for funding whether it comes from the Department of Agriculture or any other entity, but that it should come in that manner. I think it is a mistake for this body to assume the responsibility for allocation of those funds paid by producers on any other basis. The question, and the reason I have introduced this bill is because this...this amendment, is because I want to know since the funding, the \$65,000 is still included in LB 761 if there is going to be some other provision made for providing that money, or if it is still expected that it will come from the commodity boards and if so, I believe that is being presumptuous at this time. Point number two I want to make is this. There have been persons who have made the comment to me that the various commodity boards are getting a free ride in some areas in regard to services provided by state government. Again, I met with the representatives of all four boards this week in my office and they assured me that they have absolutely no objection to paying the requested fee for any service provided to them by state government. They have never challenged the fees that were charged to them for rent, lights, services of any kind, and they have no intention of doing so. If there are any services being provided to them at this time that they are not being charged for, they are anxious to be billed for those services and they will pay them, but it is wrong from my point of view, it is wrong from the members of the commodity boards with whom I visited and it is wrong from the Department of Agriculture's point of view, reference Mr. Garvin, to have an