

I have a real problem of just taking the lid, saying the sky is the limit on what you can give yourself for a per diem. That's what the amendment would do and it would be under some, a variety of financial considerations in play here. At the present time, I'm looking for my facts and need another copy of that. Well, it would take...I will give you finer details as I shuffle through the mess on my desk where it is laying, to tell you the truth. But what it would do is basically keep it at \$60, would not let that per diem increase and keep it at \$60 and then if we wanted to...ah, now I have the answer to what I want it for. As amended, the statutory \$6,000 total cap would be deleted. That's what the bill does as amended. This keeps it in at \$6,000 and so, you know, in fiscal year '90-91, you know, the per diem you're talking about \$2,000 and if you actually go up to \$120, you're talking about \$8,000 would be what they could actually...if they went to \$120, we're talking about doing. All I'm saying is you can raise the gasohol from 15 to 60, leave the ethanol at 60 and certainly don't just open it up to whatever they want to put it at, leave it at \$60. That's what my amendment does. I think that's reasonable. I ask for its adoption.

SPEAKER BAACK: Discussion on the amendment as offered by Senator Moore. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members, Senator Moore, would you respond to a question?

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: As I understand your amendment, it would, in the original draft of LB 754 on page 8, it would basically, what the committee amendment did was strike on page 8, from line 16 through the balance of the page, line 25 and then lines 1 and 2 on page 9. Is that correct?

SENATOR MOORE: Yes. That was the committee amendments did that.

SENATOR HALL: That's what the committee amendments did, they struck that.

SENATOR MOORE: Yes.