

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

March 29, 2005      LB 150

interim studies we had and the efforts that we did to try to come together with something that was...that would work and it would address the problem with the Supreme Court decision, whatever it might be, being a mandatory and that no refund, thinking it would violate the First Amendment. I'd just like to make a few other comments. The beef promotion now is a generic promotion. If we would get anything away from a generic, then you'd start promoting different brands or something like that. We'd have all kinds of problems. Some of the people have said that they don't like generic, that they would like to promote their own product, and actually that happened with, as Senator Chambers mentioned, the mushroom checkoff. It was a large mushroom producer that did not want to promote for anybody else. He wanted to use his money to promote for just himself, and they brought the lawsuit and won it. So that kind of really leaves the small people out in the cold, so...and anybody that is getting a premium for some kind of a product that they have, whether it's a value-added or they...maybe it's a grass-fed beef or something like that, if they're getting a premium, I would much rather have a premium on cattle that are worth 80 cents a hundred or 90 cents a hundred, against some that are 50 cents a hundred. If you raise the bar, a premium is on top of that. So really, everyone benefits. It doesn't make any difference who it is. The large producer contributes more. If they benefit more, they contribute more on the mandatory. We've getting some several calls, people saying we need to leave it mandatory, and I think that's best because you come up with the...those that are...that are free riders. Somebody that doesn't want to pay it, doesn't pay it, but he still benefits from it. The...actually, Senator Chambers' amendment maximizes the free rider problem because then you're going to have fewer people that are contributing and then it just degenerates from there. We have some information here from Indiana. They have a corn checkoff that they tried to do that, that you opt in. That's what Senator Chambers' amendment really does, is that you opt in, not opt out. So you have to sign something that says, I want my checkoff or my cattle to participate in the checkoff. Indiana have that and it deteriorated. It started out not too bad, but as more people saw people that were free riders, they said, I'm not going to carry this all myself, so they all started opting out. And it got down to where they're only