

think it's important to recognize that the amendment that I'm offering is an amendment that was drawn together by the Department of Agriculture and the Nebraska Seedsmen's Association as a compromise to the bill and I think it's a good compromise because not only does it lower the fees for many of the companies, it also puts in place a sliding scale so that your larger companies will be paying more and I think in general that's what we want. But if the amendment is not adopted, I think you've destroyed the compromise and, thus, I would suggest that the bill is not worth passing at this point. In fact, the Seedsmen's Association I'm sure would be against the bill then. I would move the adoption of the amendment because I do think that it is a legitimate and worthwhile compromise that everyone can live with and I would suggest that it is a compromise in which we are trying to not place a too heavy burden upon the seedsmen of this state.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Thank you. Senator Nichol, please, on the motion to return.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I certainly do rise to oppose the return of the bill and I hope if we don't return it, we kill it because then it will be palatable to no one. First of all, I object to the amendment. Who does it satisfy? It satisfied the people who want it the way they want it. In other words, stick somebody else, but not me. I thought the original inspection fee of \$7.00 per 10,000 wasn't too bad, but now we want to tailor make it for those who shouldn't be tailor making it. Secondly, I oppose the bill on the grounds that it didn't take into consideration others that were involved and I'm speaking now specifically of the dry edible bean seed which 100 percent of it comes from Idaho and why do I object to another fee being charged for that? Well, the reason is that all of that edible bean seed is inspected in Idaho and a fee is paid on it. All of the people who bring that seed to the state do pay an inspection fee. So when we talked to the seed people about exempting them out, oh, no, no, we want them to pay twice. Well, that's okay, but why do you want to have someone pay twice for the same type of inspection? Secondly, we have two entities in this state that can do this. Why don't we talk about doing away with one of those seed inspection agencies instead of talking about sticking the farmer twice? Well, we might consider that maybe the bean seed company that sells the bean seed is paying that. Ridiculous. It's passed on to the farmer. I don't think this is any time to be having a farmer paying twice for any type seed. It's been said