

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: ...to use the word "credit", it isn't analogous here and thus, in my opinion anyway, it would be a permissible thing to do. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Coordsen, please.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Mr. President, and members of the body. I had originally put my light on to call the question but I found that there was someone else that needed a little time yet to make another point, so I will say several things in the first couple of minutes. One, Senator Schmit alluded to something I told him, I think it has probably been several years ago already, Senator Smith. Comment probably made a little bit humorously but nonetheless serious, and the comment was that if we wanted to really get some good for agriculture with \$18 million, we would use that \$18 million to contribute to select members of Congress as a lobbying effort in order to effect a national ethanol plan, and probably would have had quite a great much amount more input on the ethanol use from agriculture than some of our current efforts.

PRESIDENT: Senator Coordsen, a moment. (Gavel.) Could we have it a little quieter, especially along over here on the north side, please. Thank you, Senator Coordsen.

SENATOR COORDSEN: And I had supported the 1124 as it was amended in and actually through Select File and advancement to Final Reading, until a person got a copy of what we had exactly did. There are many things in the Schmit amendment to 1124 that are beneficial. The clarification of the language to allow the Ethanol Development Authority Board to fund construction, to participate as an investor in other construction, but I guess the part that gave me the most problem was, and although I realize it is a two-year sunset, was the use of the Ethanol Development Authority Board Funds to reimburse the Highway Trust Fund for the amount of money that they were going to expend in ethanol credits, whether they were producers credits or for the blenders tax credit, and quite frankly I didn't think that this was a good use for those funds because, as the bill was written, the exposure to the Highway Trust Fund would be less under the terms of the Schmit amendment than what is currently refunded on the three cent per gallon ethanol tax credit that we currently have that is due to sunset in 1993. So all things taken in context, though I am a strong supporter of ethanol, I felt that perhaps at this point in time we needed to regroup and come in