

going to go with the program, I am sure they will have a lot of good ideas, to go as high as over \$9 million take without further authority from this Legislature and I think to kick off an untested program with this volume of dollars is not a responsible action. If...I will have to vote against the measure on that kind of dollars in a kickoff if we don't bring it downwards somewhat at least. I would support the measure if we brought it down to ten cents on that first year which would produce over \$900,000 and eventually allow it to go to twenty-five cents per head which would produce \$2,300,000 on the decision of that board. Now this is not peanuts we are talking about. We are talking about bringing the limit down from over \$9 million down to \$2,300,000 and that is a lot of dollars to authorize on a program that we really don't know how it is going to work and what the responsibility will be of the people. I believe that the beef industry needs help. I sincerely believe that but I don't think just large volumes of dollars can solve it and I think over \$900,000 is a significant amount and that is what I am asking you to bring the checkoff down to which is really, in effect, a tax because there is no refund provision. This is a marginal issue amongst farmers. Farmers voted down a beef checkoff, a mandatory beef checkoff just a few years ago in a statewide vote. It is a no win really whichever way we go but I would like to see us moderate this approach and go with the bill with a ten cent per head checkoff on the first year of implementation and allow the board to go to a twenty-five cent which would be a \$2,300,000. We never set up agencies to kick off with over \$2 million in other areas here in the state and this is downright unreasonable in the total amount I feel.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I respect Senator Burrows' concern. We have discussed it a number of times and I can tell you very frankly that Senator Burrows as a livestock person is concerned about the wide utilization of funds and I recognize that. I will have to say that I do, however, have to oppose his amendment because the industry has already drawn plans to utilize funds to the extent of the twenty-five cents per head for the first year and to adopt the amendment at this time would severely restrict that program. Now I do not believe that they will use the one dollar maximum for a long time. In previous programs we have authorized greater amounts than were utilized for a number of years and I very frankly, Senator Burrows, if I thought that it would go to the dollar right away I would be concerned about it. I don't think it will but at this time because principally