

It doesn't leave you a lot of wiggle room. You end up sort of fighting something that doesn't seem as bad as what something else might be and it's pretty much my position on this whole issue. For the 20 years that we've been dealing with it, it has always been assumed that all we needed was a little program to get something started and then it would take care of itself, wouldn't need any further subsidizing. Those dates never, ever seem to arrive. We constantly change and extend. As of today, because I'm not real sure in my mind exactly what all is in this bill when we get done, I suspect as of today at least I'll support this amendment and then try and sort it out and see what its real long-term impact might be, but I have a...I don't know if this is feasible. I can understand that where promises have been made by law and a plant is in existence, under those there is probably some obligation to continue. I'm not sure there is an obligation to expand it though to those that have not yet been constructed. I don't know if constitutionally you can do both. I'm not sure, as a matter of fact, that the whole producer credit doesn't have some constitutional issues irregardless of how it is funded. But maybe that hasn't been tested or maybe it's not a problem, but at least I think that issue is there, at least with some potential for future plants that have been talked about. As of today, as I indicated, I guess I'm willing to go along with this amendment to see where we're at, but I have lots of reservations as to what long-term commitment, in fact, we are implying once we do this. I would be much more willing and Senator Schmit talks about when the fund runs out, frankly, I wouldn't have a problem with supporting fund...that is, when the gasohol fund runs out, I wouldn't have any problem with extending the checkoff if that's what it took. It would seem to me much more appropriate to fund this out of a checkoff than it is to fund it out of the Highway User who may or may not have any relationship because all you do when you do that is you fund it with higher taxes because the highway program essentially is going to be the same and the same would be true at the city and county level. Their program is going to be the same.

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR WARNER: They either fund it with property tax or with their share of the revenue but, essentially, in the long run, they have to fund the same level just for the maintenance of their highway program, nothing gained, nothing lost, in the long run, as far as cost but the costs are going to be the same.