

SENATOR R. JOHNSON: Thank you, Madam President. I wish, first of all, to thank those who I know maybe do not support the program but at least afforded me and the supporters of this motion to have our day in front of a full complement of legislators. I think the program and the funding has been adequately discussed in the reconsideration motion. I guess I would only yield myself to questions if there are any and hold the rest of my comments till I close on the amendment. So I would simply ask for the adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Johnson. Senator Warner, followed by Senator Coordsen.

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, since we've spent so much time on this, I wanted to indicate one other alternative that could be considered. I've got a long history with this issue, the first...in 1963 I had a bill that dealt with this issue. And the issue at that time for funding this kind of an operation and which was agreed to by quite a few of the agricultural entities at that time but it had a, I guess, nowadays we would call it a checkoff but it was an assessment on a per head basis. There's different kinds of assessment depending on...on whether it was cattle it was one number, poultry, turkeys had a smaller number. It also was feasible to do in those days because we also had personal property tax on livestock so you had a count and that count was to be used for funding and, in fact, the Legislature passed that bill. It never was implemented because we were depending upon a federal report for some of the counts in the thing, in addition to the personal property tax and, unfortunately, the date that the assessment had to be made and the availability of the federal funds, the federal data was one month later, that is federal data was one month late so as a practical matter it couldn't be implemented and there is another long story to it. But, in any event, it was eventually repealed. I'm only mentioning it that it's another one of these areas where it's easy to justify, as are in so many areas, that we ought to put General Fund programs in and expand it so it includes both urban and rural areas at the federal level which, incidentally, was done to preserve it at the federal level. But I think there is a good policy issue that one ought to look at, whether or not these are the kinds of programs that those who benefit ought to from fee method support or if it should be a General Fund operation of state government which will, obviously, grow and Senator Schmit will then be able