

to make investments in some of the equipment that will be functioning inside the plant. So, again, as I said, I support the Schmit amendment. I support what the authority has done up to this point, even though certainly we'd like to see a number of plants up and operating, that hasn't been the case. But I think, as I said in my earlier comments, that there are proposals that are being considered now by the authority that will, I think, produce some benefits for Nebraska and for the growers that contributed dollars into the program. The goal, of course, is not only to use up grain, it is to help clean up the environment. This bill addresses air quality. We haven't talked about that yet, but that is a side benefit of this issue as well that we might also want to consider. So, as I said, I support the Schmit amendment. I think it defuses some of the negative aspects of the Haberman amendment.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. The member from Hastings, Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am not sitting in your chair. I keep getting mixed up with Kristensen's desk and mine. But I'm at my own speaking point right now. I would just rise also to support Senator Schmit's motion. And I'm not going to try to repeat all the things that have been said. I would just simply state that for anyone who has visited an ethanol plant you would find that there is very little bricks and mortar but a heck of a lot of equipment. So if you were going to eliminate the capability for them to use the funds to invest in equipment you would remove most of the reason for the funds to be utilized in that way. Rex, I just have one more little thing I'd like to say to you. You'll be so glad to know I found out that the ADC plant in Hastings is operating, so maybe I am pork-barreling. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Senator Smith, members of the body, Senator Smith, I would not, I would not stand up here in front of your colleagues and even hint of pork-barreling. Senator Schmit made the remark that these entities could buy cheap equipment. They could go out and buy cheap equipment. Now that doesn't really necessarily follow that if we buy equipment it would also be a little return on liquidation. So, if we go out and buy cheap equipment, there must have been something wrong for the equipment to be cheap in the first place. That's right, stop