

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

May 13, 1999

LB 605

if you had, for example, left over at the end \$3 million of General Funds and \$3 million of checkoff or producer fees, all of that \$3 million of General Funds would go back to the checkoff, to the producers into the checkoff program. So what the amendment would do is say that the funds would go back wherever they came from; so if there are any General Funds left over, they essentially go back into the General Funds and checkoff funds go back into the checkoff amount. With regard to the reduction of \$1 million in General Funds, you may remember on General File we talked about the original deal that was made and the fact that it was supposed to be 50, about 50-50 from each source of funds, General Funds and producer fees. And in Senator Stuhr's original amendment, the checkoff was dropped, as you heard earlier, from three-quarters to a half a cent. That had the effect of reducing the producer fees into the program by somewhere between \$2 million and \$3 million. So what I'm suggesting to you today as a matter...and when we tried to restore the checkoff money on the argument that it was not in accordance with the original deal, everybody said, yeah, it wasn't in accordance with the original deal but things are tough for agriculture, which they are, of course. But what this amendment suggests is that there at least be some measure of equity by reducing the General Funds by \$1 million. Theoretically to be absolutely correct, you ought to reduce the General Funds by between \$2 million to \$3 million. But at least there ought to be some recognition to the original deal and some recognition to the sales and income taxpayers from every place in the state, including Lincoln and Omaha, that, yes, the deal was broken, we broke the deal; but you get to break it a little bit yourselves anyway. It's unfortunate, it's always unfortunate when conditions are bad in agriculture. It's unfortunate when conditions are bad in any of our major industries. But I don't think that when any industry goes into the down part of its cycle it should think that it can come to the Legislature and get out of regulatory fees or their participation in programs of one type or another that are designed for the overall well-being of the economy. If we're going to start following that principle very strongly, there will be all kinds of industries in here at different points in time of the economy and saying times are tough for us now, let us renege on whatever were the original sharing of costs in a particular situation. So recognizing to some extent the