

by, one, bringing more companies into the state which is what we want to do; but, two, you also reduce the level of income going into the program by reducing the reliance on the trust fund. There is no money coming out of the checkoff program any longer going into the ethanol fund so it's a stagnant fund so to speak. And as these programs, I should say these companies come on line and if all of them do come on line, the fund will be broke in a very short period of time. This bill does not touch upon that aspect of how we're going to find new funding sources. And I think there have been a number of folks who object to the idea of reinstating any new checkoffs. Senator Lynch has indicated here he doesn't want any General Funds or trust funds or anything used. And I guess I'm curious at some point in time as this debate progresses for people to start talking about how we're going to pay for the program because that \$18 million we've got in there, it's almost all committed and how we're going to sustain the production credits as more ethanol is produced in the state is a legitimate concern that we should worry about. Because you don't stand on the tracks and wait for the train to hit you to move. You've got to move in advance to that. And I think this body probably next year is going to have to do something to address the funding problem because I can see it and the printouts that we've got, in fact, I've got one here, shows that it isn't going to be too much longer before that fund is exhausted. And we're going to have contracts with these basic companies to provide that production credit. And I'm very curious as to whose pocket it is going to come out of to support the ethanol program. I support it and I've always supported it, but I'm also one that advocates the idea of looking to avoid a really significant problem by addressing it in advance rather than waiting for a crisis management kind of scenario to develop before we start talking about how to pay for the program before those funds are exhausted.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Rod Johnson. Senator Schmit, did you wish to address this amendment?

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, yes. I support the Withem (sic) amendment. I think it outlines pretty well how the funding will take place. I don't see my friend Danny Lynch here, but I thought you have to credit Senator Rod Johnson with one hit on that one because actually if we went back and rewrote 775 to do what it was suggested, the Rotunda would be much more full than it is right now. Any any little attempt we make to change 775, Rod, I think draws lots of attention and causes