

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

March 12, 2003 LB 619

believe that some of those Sandhill farmers that have had cattle herds had to decrease those because of the situation. Agriculture does have a domino effect on our whole economy. In talking about the livestock industry, it is a very important industry to our state. It actually provides about 61 percent of all of the ag receipts, so we are pledged to try to improve and do what we can, but I do believe that people are very concerned about the natural resources that we have and are trying to protect those. But I am opposed to the amendment and I think all of us are pledged to work together on the issue. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Stuhr. Senator Beutler, there are no further lights on. You're recognized to close, if you care to.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature, this is the time and the place, and the issue is not nearly as simple as the rhetoric on this floor today. First of all, to start with, a great many people in this body and I, long before you were even in this body, Senator Schrock, supported ethanol, even though it had no direct relationship to my district. Senator Schmit and myself were the two people in here who made ethanol into something that was okay for people to talk about. And I have always supported property tax caps and limitations, as you know. But we're cutting DEQ by 10 percent. We cannot cut them by 10 percent. The programs have to be manned, so we will increase General Funds to do that. When we increase General Funds in DEQ to do that, we decrease General Funds in state aid to schools, state aid to counties, state aid to local political subdivisions of all types. When we do that, the farmers pay more property tax. And the farmers that pay that property tax are all farmers, regardless of whether they have a livestock waste facility. And so really, the bottom-line argument is, do you want all farmers paying for this, or do you want farmers who have livestock waste facilities paying for it? I think that that's the real question here and that a lot of this, what's happening today, is a lot of rhetoric that seeks to avoid the real question of which farmers are going to pay for this. That's the question, in a tight state budget, where you're not going to have enough money, you're cutting state aid to local political subdivisions. I think that's the real