

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

March 12, 2003 LB 619

which for a regulatory program is very high general funding to start with. But in the area of agriculture, we've tried to help out by alleviating fees and substituting General Funds to some extent. And then it was anticipated and agreed upon that it would be about 32 percent cash funded; that is, from fees related to the permitting and the inspection of the livestock facilities. Well, what happened in fact and through subsequent amendments to the Livestock Facilities Act was that the cash funding dissipated and continues to dissipate and there's heavier and heavier reliance upon the General Fund in order to fund this regulatory program. Over on the right-hand side of that sheet you see I've penciled in the projections for '03-04, '04-05, the next two fiscal years, what the percentage of cash funds will be unless we change the system. And I don't know if that bill is permanently trapped in committee, but Senator Schrock talks about an interim study and holding off on all these fees until there's an interim study, and my argument would be there is no reason for an interim study on this matter. We know what these fees are. We know that they should be contributing substantially more to the funding of this program than they do right now. Ten percent is just totally unacceptable. It's like we're starting into the process of general funding regulatory programs where I think you should be making the argument that the industry itself, regardless of the industry, should be the ones picking up the cost of the regulatory program. By way of comparison, for example, the Department of Insurance, the entire costs of the Department of Insurance are picked up by fees levied against the insurance industry. The entire costs of the Department of Banking are picked up by fees levied against the banking industry. Granted, agriculture is perhaps not doing as well as those two industries, but it is, to me, an unacceptable process to suggest that the funding of this program should be entirely or fundamentally General Funds. There ought to be a sizeable and a meaningful contribution from the industry regulated. If, and it's...and you...I would also point out to you that for the last two years this same problem existed but nothing was done about it, so it has already been delayed. This is the third year. Two years ago we transferred money from another Department of Agriculture Cash Fund in order to supplement the Cash Fund side. And last year we did the same thing. This year we're doing the