

Senator Wesely's remarks go unanswered. I believe it is a critical part of the bill. It is a critical part of the legislation. It's a critical part of the ethanol industry. It may be the most significant part of the entire bill. There are those who believe that ETBE will be the major factor in the use of the new type of fuel development. What we are saying if you strike Section 10, and I disagree a little bit with my friend Senator Wehrbein, what we're saying is that as of now we're not interested in the development of ETBE. We are closing the gate on that part of that product line. We should not do that. We are making a business decision and we shouldn't do it. Now if at another time we decide that we want to handle the incentive in a different manner, we can do that. But very frankly, this is not the time to take that section out of the bill. We ought to encourage Chief Industries is going to make a \$20-30 million investment at Hastings. There's a \$57 million investment at Columbus. There is a substantial investment at Sutherland. And we can expect I think further development whether it is at Nebraska City or somewhere else. But we ought not to say, well, you can do this but you can't do that. It doesn't make any sense, doesn't make any sense. It's like saying to the packing house industry you can't take the leather from the hide off of a steer and use it in a productive manner. It's got to go in the tankage. That doesn't make any sense. You want them to develop to the highest and best utilization every aspect of the ethanol industry. Wet corn milling is new, it's a new process, something we weren't talking about 20 years ago. But today it is a major new industry and the ethanol, although a major product, is not the principal product of that wet milling process. So we shouldn't take the position of making a decision on this floor saying, well, we don't know what it's going to cost. We know one thing, Senator, it will not cost much money between now and next January. It's not going to cost much money, a few thousand dollars maybe, maybe a few more. But it ought to be in place so that if someone who is in the industry, whether it's Chief Industries, or whether it's Minnesota Corn Processors, whether it's Cargill or Sutherland or whatever it is can come here and say we want to continue the ETBE process and the development of it. Why should we say no or be negative toward a Nebraska based additive and encourage the development of a non-Nebraska additive, which, by the way is not nearly as satisfactory in the fuel development process as is ETBE? You can be sure, ladies and gentlemen, that we are directly or indirectly subsidizing the development of MTBE. We ought not to discourage the development of ETBE. Again, I want to say this.