

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

May 14, 2001

LB 536

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I didn't really intend to speak on this. I assume that this amendment which now contains the more complicated Raikes formula is...is less acceptable than what we just defeated, so I don't suppose there is any point to further debate on this, but I will listen to the debate. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Landis, on FA239.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I voted against the Raikes amendment the last time. I'm...I would think that the body was giving its opinion on the Raikes amendment, that concept, in the last vote, so I think that we're spinning our wheels on this amendment and I think it probably ought to be withdrawn. But I want to use this opportunity to address where I think we are on the ethanol issue because as I understand it Senator Wehrbein is going to offer an amendment to take off the gluten tax. One of the reasons I vote against the Raikes amendment is you can't hijack somebody else's bill in the middle of Select File and have them carry the bill across the finishing line. What they will do if you take the bill away and so something that's really antithetical to what they want, they'll just simply drop the bill where it is, and it doesn't go anywhere. It's why the Raikes amendment is valuable for an intellectual exercise, but it doesn't...my guess is that the...even the forces that want ethanol production credits wouldn't support the bill in that form because they wouldn't want that precedent set. So it's, in a sense, if you don't like the bill that much, voting against it is the right thing to do because the body is not going to do a radically different ethanol mechanism on Select File. I voted against it, not because it's a bad idea, but because you can't make Senator Dierks and Senator Cunningham carry this idea. Senator Raikes is going to have to carry this idea or the Revenue Committee is going to have to carry this idea, not the forces that are in favor of ethanol. There's a very analogous history here. When we first passed the performance jobs credits, the bill was written by those folks, and every sensible attempt at altering that bill was fought tooth and nail. And the only way it was done was by the Revenue Committee starting over and at various