

if I would take the time to poll every member of this Legislature who is a farmer themselves and ask them if they fill those reports out or if they pay any attention to them, I would venture a guess that the vast majority of them would say no. And the same thing is true if you asked any group that has agricultural people involved in it. What it amounts to, for those of you from the urban areas that maybe don't understand it, is that they send out these questionnaires and they ask you how many cows you are going to have next year, and how many calves they are going to have, and how many pigs you are going to have, and how many sows you are going to farrow, and how many acres of corn you are going to plant, and all this nice kind of stuff, and then they disseminate all this information about we are going to have an increase in hog numbers or decrease or whatever, and guess who that benefits. Obviously it benefits the purchasers of our products, if it benefits anybody, because they know what their supply is going to be. It is going to be larger at a certain point in time or it is going to be smaller at a certain point in time, assuming there is some validity to the information. I have always wondered how there was any validity when hardly anybody fills them out. But as far as the value to the individual farmer, my farrowing house is only so large. I can only farrow so many sows. My pastures are only so big. I can only have so many cows, and I am going to have that number regardless of what the statistics might indicate that there might be. People only have so many acres of ground. They are going to plant it to whatever crops that they plant largely based on federal programs or based on current prices but not necessarily based on some projection that they might have got from some statistician. So it doesn't really affect farmers a whole lot and it doesn't make them change their plans a whole lot. It doesn't benefit them a whole lot. So if the purpose of public expenditures in the Department of Agriculture is designed to benefit Nebraskans, then it seems to me that here is an area you could logically cut. Here is an area you could logically say we don't really need these large kinds of expenditures. If the federal government wants to collect some general types of statistics, then let the federal government pay for it. We are not in the Congress. We can't make that decision. If we need to get some information for our ag land valuation mechanisms, we are still leaving \$39,000 here. That should give them enough funds to collect a considerable amount of information as far as ag land valuation is concerned. Quite