

\$13 million in each of those years; \$9 million in '99 and the year 2000; and \$3 million in 2000 and 2001. I guess my question, if this was previously in the bill, I apologize for waiting until Select File to bring it up, but I guess my questions are, what happens, does this legally obligate the state? Is the State Treasurer obligated to make these transfers? Or is this contingent upon an appropriation bill passing that has this language in it? What happens if...can we, as the Legislature sitting in '95 and again in '96, obligate future Legislatures to actually make these appropriations?

SENATOR HALL: Senator McKenzie.

SPEAKER WITHEM: That's the substance of my question. Senator McKenzie, I'll ask you, and I would also be interested, because this is part of the committee amendment, maybe Senator Warner could respond.

SENATOR HALL: Senator McKenzie.

SENATOR MCKENZIE: Senator Withem, my understanding is this is a direct transfer and does not require an appropriation, and, yes, it does, to some extent, in intent at least, obligate future Legislatures or the General Fund to appropriate those amounts of money.

SPEAKER WITHEM: So your sense would be that the State Treasurer would be obligated to make this transfer and, in effect, these are the first dollars that are obligated for appropriation in the '97-98, before we begin building our budget, we are agreeing that we're going to spend \$13 million coming out of the General Fund into the Ethanol Production Incentive Cash Fund?

SENATOR MCKENZIE: That's correct.

SPEAKER WITHEM: That's your interpretation. Senator Warner, do you agree with that interpretation?

SENATOR HALL: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: I'm not sure.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Okay. We don't...we don't have the Chair of our Appropriations Committee on the floor. Is the Vice-Chair of the Appropriations Committee on the floor? I think...I don't