

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

March 3, 2004

LB 962

when we're back here next year, but for this year, I'm comfortable. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Wehrbein. Senator Beutler. This will be your third time, Senator.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature, Senator, I don't disagree with anything you said in terms of the importance of water or the need to deal with this bill. But I am concerned and do have different feelings than Senator Schrock about how it's financed and how that financing should be shared. Agriculture is obviously important to the state, but every segment of our industrial and economic base is important to the state. And in that sense, I suppose one could always argue with respect to any industry that it should be shared by the whole state because it's part of our...part of our economic well-being. But with respect to most of our enterprises, we try to associate the costs of that enterprise closely with the industry itself, much as a business would, so that it has the benefit that I perceive in a business of doing some very strict cost accounting. That is, we...if we associate all the costs to a particular industry, we know what that industry is costing us. We know if we're subsidizing it. We know if it's paying its own way. We know basically its level of profitability. If you start using General Funds to subsidize all the different industries in your state, you're starting a process by which you start to treat industries differently. For example, with regard to clean air and clean water, most all commercial and industrial establishments pay for their own cost of regulation. If you're in banking or insurance, the entire Department of Banking, the entire Department of Insurance is funded by fees against the companies that are regulated, the industry and the people that are regulated. That's the way that we've...that we've done things, and I think that's the way that makes sense. And when you do it for some but not for others, that, to me, is a kind of distinction that is not justified in terms of the fairness of the situation. And I don't know if that...if you intended to say, Senator Wehrbein, that you would be against any sort of fees in this situation. I might just ask you, are you against a sharing arrangement, much as if we...as we do ethanol, for example, or are you a straight General Fund man on this?