

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

February 16, 2005 LB 150

SENATOR ERDMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the Legislature, I appreciate the discussion, Senator Schrock and others, and I...specifically on the proposal. I want to thank the Chairmen for their efforts in this area. I know that whether it was Chairman Kremer or Chairman Dierks at the time, where we've addressed some of these issues there's been a lot of discussions and trying to move people to an agreeable position, and I think that's ultimately what's going to happen here. I appreciate Senator Loudon pointed out the fiscal note and the pass-through provision, essentially, that will happen and how the collection, and then the A bill that follows, will allow the department then to distribute that money to the entity that they contract with. And I think Senator Beutler brings up some very important points, specifically, on the refund provision. We have a number of programs in the state, or checkoffs or excise tax, whatever, that are mandatory, but we do have some that are voluntary. And, as was pointed out in the committee hearing, one of those that I'm most familiar with is we have the dry bean checkoff, which is a refundable provision, much as what LB 150 would be, and I think to this point it's less than 5 percent annually get refunds out of that provision. Now, realistically, a majority of the beans are probably grown by a large operator, and so it would be pretty easy to say, well, the reason why LB 150 won't work on the refund part is because these other places, the large guys are taking their money out so that we can't promote the product, we can't do the research and development. Simply not the case. So I think the way that we know that something like this could work is by looking at the track record for those areas, and specifically those commodities, in which we have seen success, and I think that's important to look at. This is not uncharted territory. The uncharted part about this probably is we're not completely certain what the U.S. Supreme Court may rule in the beef checkoff. We're trying to position the state and the livestock industry, specifically the beef industry, to be prepared for what decision may come down. When you look at the cost to the state of losing an industry, whether it's due to a scare due to a bioterrorism issue, or whether it's the lack of ability to promote the product or the ability...the lack of the markets that may be available, we have a vested interest as a state