

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

May 9, 2001

LB 536, 620

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: ...but I can't help thinking that way.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Wickersham. Senator Chambers, on the first part of the divided question to LB 536.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I'm for it. I need to remind Senator Schrock, Senator Dierks, Senator Cunningham, of what is going on that is different in these urban payouts than this rural greed. Greed. Neither Senator Schrock or Senator Cunningham can show me any of these urban payouts, which I disagree with, these urban handouts, where there is a direct payout from the General Fund. LB 620 for Union Pacific does not include a payout from the state General Fund as this bill, LB 536, does. That is the difference. The rural people are saying, the speculators, that is, who have duped these farmers into thinking that when the speculators get rich, the farmers are going to benefit. The speculators are the ones pulling the chain, pushing these farmers in here to say, give us some direct General Fund money. That does not exist in these other programs. That's the difference. But when Senator Schrock was talking about the fuel costs of Union Pacific and all the rest of these things, if he looked at LB 620, he would see that rolling stock or rail cars do not qualify as qualified property in which an investment can be made, for the purpose of getting the tax credits. So what he is talking about is not even implicated in LB 620, the Union Pacific bill, as a basis for getting the tax credits. The two are not the same, but I oppose both of them, all these giveaways. What these people in the Legislature and the speculators in ethanol are admitting is that what I say is correct. They cannot survive without the subsidies. And when the federal government drops that subsidy, it's over. There will never be broad-based state support generated for ethanol production because the other states are not as dumb as the people in Nebraska. If all of these states producing ethanol are looking to California as a customer because they think that California is going to have to phase out MTBE, that they're going to not meet clean air standards and, therefore, ethanol