

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Cudaback.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Mr. Speaker and members of the body, I feel privileged to have a bill here like this that I can carry as my priority bill. I, too, had the same concerns as Senator Schmit had but I have read through this bill. I don't thoroughly understand it like Senator Rogers does, but the federal regulations and so on in there, they are just as strict as the state's are now. So with this in mind, and with the regulations that we have, I just don't see how we can go wrong. In the name of efficiency, we all know that we can use more of that, and with that in mind, I urge your support for this bill. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Cudaback. Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, members, I have some answers, perhaps, for Senator Schmit, if you'd care to. You were wondering about some of the things, first of all, this is a federally mandated \$1 checkoff, so it really has nothing to do with Nebraska law today. This is collected...mandated at the federal level. Nebraska's response is the six man or seven person, six or seven person, I can't think of it...six person in Nebraska is elected, one of the few commodity boards, if any, in Nebraska that is elected. In 1989-90, there was \$3,383,964 raised in Nebraska at the 50 cent level. So if you double that, it would be about \$7.6 million raised in Nebraska at the \$1 checkoff level. There was 2.9 million, so nearly \$6 million of that was spent. I have to confess some of this is coming off the top of my head because I don't have the figures in front of me, but if I remember, about 25 cents stays in the state, and about 75 cents can go nationally, and at the nationally, the 120, you mentioned 156, I think it is a 124 man...person board that is involved with this at the federal level, takes in grants, does advertising, does promotion, does some promotional research. There can be up to 25 percent of the funds used nationally to influence federal legislation. I feel that this is an appropriate thing for this agency to do. I admit I was skeptical when it first started because of the fact that it did...was involved under state funds when it was originally started. But as it became a federal mandate under the federal checkoff legislation several years ago, it stands to reason that since the state has no part in the raising of the funds, it, therefore, really doesn't have much authority to have any say-so in the expenditure of the funds. I also would pay compliments