

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

March 17, 2004 LB 916, 962A

enacted into law which obliges the Legislature to pay large amounts of money and the means of paying that are not present at the time. It seems that we get in more trouble with rural-oriented bills when that occurs, and I'm thinking about ethanol. When I fought against the Legislature caving in to the purveyors, the investors, and the speculators, my colleagues wanted to go ahead and do it because of the pressure that the lobbyists brought to bear. Now the Legislature is facing very serious fiscal repercussions. I am not going to support this bill ultimately if there is not a suitable and acceptable funding mechanism. I have not, prior to now, talked about how galled I am to hear these senators try to extract from me some sympathy because these irrigators who created the problem are talking about, will we pay taxes? If we improve our land, the taxes go up, and don't tax agriculture, and we'll do this, that, and the other. They should...the ones who create the problem ought to pay for it when they can afford to. And that's where the rub comes in. They always want somebody else to pay. LB 916 is designed to make the public pay the lion's share of cleaning up a mess that was created by those who are in agriculture and produced a lot of animal waste. They are getting to the point of overburdening the system and I am not going to go along with it. This bill can move to Select File. That doesn't mean it's going anywhere beyond that. And I don't blame Senator Schrock for trying to get a bill that may be somewhat wounded as far along the path as possible, even though its ultimate chances look bleak. You do it a day at the time, a step at the time, but I don't want my silence this morning to be misconstrued as being support for the bill. There will be plenty of opportunity on Select File to continue dealing with it. But the major item that I have talked to Senator Schrock about early on, he and I reached an agreement on. So I told him, based on that show of good faith by him, that's not the exact language I used, I would not have anything else to say on the bill this morning. I would not do anything to hinder its moving forward. But there still are problems with the whole notion that the urban and other people should pay for the messes created by agriculture. They can talk all they want to about agriculture being the number one industry in Nebraska. Nebraska probably processes or packs more beef than anybody else but it's not because there are small producers doing that. It happens