

the Revenue Committee was a fair compromise and that we ought not to be tinkering with it and if anything, it's still a tremendously good deal for the farmers. One of the things, when I think of the double-dipping of Micron, that is how it represents a double-dipping in the sense of incentives above and beyond 775 and then you look at what we're doing with ethanol and as I indicated before, I think that what we've done with Micron provides the justification that I didn't think was there last year for providing General Funds at all. But there is some justification in terms of how we treated other people for the General Fund contribution, but at the same time, the \$75 million that will be provided as incentives for the ethanol plants is a bird in hand, is a bird in hand. Micron may flutter away as may Pfizer, and it may be that those double-dipping possibilities will not materialize at all nor may any other plant of that size come along for quite some period of time. So as comparing the two layers of double-dipping, this is a very good deal for those who are interested in ethanol plants because there's 75 million sure bucks here out of the General Funds and that's a pretty good deal. I go back again, you know saying how tough this is for the farmers, I just don't believe it, I just don't believe it. Here you have a product that has increased the market by 10 percent, increased the market by 10 percent, and if that pushed prices up by two cents and if the price of corn were 2.25, that means that a 10 percent increase in the market, if it just increased the price by 1 percent, two cents over 2.25, is a two-cent advantage to the seller of the grain. So whether you're paying a half or whether you're paying three-quarters, it's a good deal even under the most, even under the worst case scenarios that I think you can put forward with a straight face on this particular situation. So I don't know if three-quarters is right, but considering the changes that have come about since last year, it's certainly in the neighborhood of right, but if it's wrong, I think it's wrong in putting too much General Funds in it. And I think we ought to stick with the wisdom of the Revenue Committee and Senator Bromm says what assurance is there that you won't be back in asking for more checkoff money in two years. Well there is about the same amount of assurance that there was two years ago when certain farm senators promised that there would be a \$4 fertilizer tax and a couple years later there was not, but that's life. Things change, things fluctuate, you can't promise about the future. But I think by and large, on most of these kinds of things, once it has been agreed upon, it pretty much is stuck to, at least until the present generation forgets or passes. Thank you.