

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

March 20, 2002 LB 1310

tank problems would not be as great as they are. Ethanol does not contaminate underground water if it leaks from a tank and certainly MTBE and a lot of the benzenes and other things they use to enhance octane do. If we had been using exclusively ethanol in this state for 20 years, our leaky underground storage tank problems would not be to the magnitude that they are. It's just the way it is, folks. So, with that, I'll give the rest of my time back to the Chair.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I don't think Senator Wehrbein understands my amendment. Senator Wehrbein, my amendment does not touch the transfer. The transfer stays in place. The \$6 million will be taken from the fund and put into the General Fund. My amendment does not touch that. I, by standing here now, have amended my original amendment so it does not strike all of Section 7. It doesn't strike anything related to the transfer. It simply goes into the existing law to strike the word "only" so that it's clear that these funds may be used for other purposes. But the striking of this word will not let DEQ automatically spend it for anything else because we still have the list there. The only way money could be spent from this fund other than for that laundry list would be for us to pass a bill that added to the laundry list or took away from it. What my amendment would do is put this section of statute in the same condition as the statutes dealing with those other programs you talked about. Not one of them says that the money in those programs will be spent only for. This is the only one I'm aware of where we have that. Even with the tobacco program, that I was fighting yesterday to prevent from losing money, does not have the word "only". It does not say that money will be spent only for such and such. This section does. It's clear from what we're doing here today that the word "only" is not going to bind us. So I want to strike that word "only" because it serves no purpose. Now, if we don't strike "only" what are we left with? We're left with a situation where somebody reading the statute would get the impression that this fund is sacrosanct and that the Legislature will never touch it, which obviously is not true. What my amendment would do is to bring the statute into