

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

March 27, 2003 LB 479

that the time is not right at this point to continue with adding more checkoffs at this point in time because our farmers are having a difficult time. Fertilizer, chemicals, all of the inputs are up. The cost of production is great and the benefit margins are low. We have the opportunity at some point in time to come back again, even if we do an emergency clause next year, and we'll have plenty of time to look at this issue. At this point, I'll turn the time back to the floor. Thank you.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator McDonald. Senator Vrtiska.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body. I'm going to rise to oppose the bracket motion for some of the same reasons that have been addressed before me, so I'm not going to go over those, but I think most of you are aware of what we're talking about. There's talk about public money should go in to provide for ethanol production because public used it. Well, as a matter of fact, public money does go into it. It's been demonstrated earlier there are a number of...there are a number of programs available when ethanol plants are built, so there is public money going into these plants and we have to remember that. One of the questions that I have, and I don't know, is Senator Schrock here? Senator Schrock, could I ask you a question?

SPEAKER BROMM: Senator Schrock, would you yield?

SENATOR SCHROCK: Yes.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Senator Schrock, you know, we've been talking about the amount of funds that are available until, what, 2004 to 2006 if plants are built?

SENATOR SCHROCK: That's correct.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Now is that based on the number of plants that are projected, or the number of plants that are out there now? And your guess...best guess, will there be more plants built?

SENATOR SCHROCK: Senator Vrtiska, the chart that I've passed out projects where the EPIC Fund is. For example, if we have