

on bringing a bill in next year or the year after to change it. But let's not go to the back door and try to change the plan here and say it's our intent rather than we're going to do it. I urge the body to defeat the amendment to the amendment by Bernard-Stevens. Thank you.

**SPEAKER WITHEM PRESIDING**

**SPEAKER WITHEM:** Thank you, Senator Bromm. Senator McKenzie, followed by Senator Wehrbein.

**SENATOR MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. President and members of the body, I rise in opposition to the Bernard-Stevens amendment, although I can state that in general policy I think his arguments are very good and very valid. On the other hand, my argument would be that in the case of what we are trying to do in 377 in supporting economic incentives, production credit incentives that this body obligated us too many years ago makes this a little different situation. I could ask the question, how much of a hit does the General Fund take every year from 775? I guess it's not clear. We have a terrible time finding that answer and yet I believe 775 is important and I supported all of the legislation dealing with additional economic incentives. I believe we have an obligation to solve this problem and to do it in a way that is up front, that shows people, in fact, how much money it is costing us to support these economic incentives and that the taxpayer can clearly see what they have invested to get the benefit from these six new plants and new jobs in the state. I fear for the fact that David Bernard-Stevens mentions that we are operating on some fear here and I guess that is generated by a number of producers who said we were once given a promise that we would have 18 months of checkoff and never see it again, and we are back now asking them to do another checkoff, another excise tax. So we have asked people to do that because of the success of this program for no other reason and I think it is a fair split and I think agriculture's willingness to come to the table and tax themselves is important. And my perspective about the General Fund money is that because we have contracts and because this is an obligation that I believe we can live with a direct transfer in this policy decision rather than in appropriations, and I would agree that I think the Appropriations Committee would respect the intent language in the amendment. However, this particular language was language that came to the bill from the committee amendment. It was in the bill during first round of