

economic circumstances of the time. It would simply automatically be done. I could see this as being a tool in criminal justice. I could see it being a tool, certainly, on prisons, all sorts of things that we might want to do this type of process. And I think it's a dangerous precedent to begin setting and I think Senator Warner may have, in fact, an amendment that will be coming that might help clarify a little bit what we're trying to do but I think the best policy for the Legislature is to say, look, we've made the statutory change to what we want to do. We've made the obligation but let's stry with tradition. The tradition is and the role of the Legislature is we cannot bind and should not bind future legislatures. We don't know, it may be that two years from now when we're back that the federal government actually has cut a trillion, too, from its budget or beginning to and we have lost two to \$3 million worth of federal dollars because of the balanced budget amendment. We don't know what's going to happen. And it's a dangerous policy to say no matter what happens, we're not going to have the ability to review that. So I think Senator Withem has brought up a good point. I think by making a change and making it so that we at least can go back in the next biennium, it does always raise the specter, well, maybe we won't appropriate the dollars and then what do we do for ethanol? But I would remind the body that we're already as a state obligated to those dollars one way or another and we would have to come up with some type of mechanism to do it because it is an incentive program on the production side and we would have to do it, but it would leave open for the Legislature to find the best way possible if, in fact, we could not simply do a direct General Fund appropriation. So I appreciate the amendment, or at least the discussion point Senator Withem has brought up and I'll be interested to see how the Warner amendment that I haven't seen yet directs this. So with that I yield back the rest of my time.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. Senator McKenzie, on the Withem amendment.

SENATOR MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the body, there's some interesting points raised in this discussion, but it seems odd to me that when we're talking about solving a problem that relates to economic development in light of the many hours of discussion we had on other wishful thinking for economic development, that we would want to jeopardize the credit or the stability of six plants who hold contracts with