

But if we did that, there would be one other thing, in my opinion, that would have to be done to be consistent with some of these amendments, and that is we'd better find an A bill that we amend the appropriation on the Ethanol Authority to limit those funds as to how they can be used. I am assuming they ought to be limited for production credit only, and no new investment, which would be consistent with, at least, some of the approaches that I have heard. I don't know if that is in Senator Schrock's or not, but if that was done, then that Ethanol Fund would last significantly longer. But I do have strong feelings, as one who is in agriculture, that if the benefit of ethanol production is higher pricing corn, and if the 20 cents figure is right, and it costs a 1/2 cent, that is on 2 1/2 cents for every \$1 increase in corn, that is 800...or 12 1/2 cents, rather, on every \$1 increase in corn, that is like an 800 percent return, and I don't see how anyone in agriculture could object to investing 12 1/2 cents to get an 800 percent return, if that is the right figures, and add another \$1 to the price of 5 bushels of corn. What has happened year after year, after year, we have nothing but a history of a series of broken commitments as to what was going to be the policy, and every time that we set one, it comes back and is immediately changed. You hear complaints from producers, or potential producers, they don't know. Agriculture doesn't know. I would hope that if we are going to deal with the bill that we would establish the checkoff to be a part of it so it is there, when it becomes necessary to use it. We don't go to another extension a couple three years from now. Those kind of approaches would make much sense to me but I also would agree that if we get completely bogged down because of a difficulty of writing a variety of amendments, maybe bracketing is not that bad an idea. I will be glad to hear Senator Schmit's comments on that.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Legislature. Senator Warner's comments are very appropriate and I appreciate the fact that Senator Schrock took this bill as a priority bill, or else I would have had to reorganize my priorities, I guess should have anyway since my priority didn't go anywhere. But the facts are that this bill does contain, and the Johnson amendment contains some language which I believe we need. Now it is unfortunate, and Senator Moore said it is too bad that we debate ethanol bills the last 10 days of the session. As I look back, we could have adjourned sine die five