

CLERK: Senator Warner would move to amend. Pull that, Senator?

SENATOR HALL: Senator Warner pulls that amendment.

CLERK: Senator Bernard-Stevens, I believe, Mr. President, would move to amend. (Bernard-Stevens amendment, FA82, appears on page 1226 of the Legislative Journal.)

SENATOR HALL: Senator Bernard-Stevens, to open on the amendment to the amendment.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you. This amendment has been handed out to the body. It deals with the...on the McKenzie amendment, it deals with Section 4 and that would be for those that are following on page 1209 in the Journal, 1209 in the Journal, Section 4. And in essence the only thing this amendment will do, it does not change any of the dollar amounts. It does not "deobligate" the state, if that's a word, "deobligate", I like that word though, should be a word if it's not, it will not "deobligate" the state for any of the payments that we have promised to make in the EPIC Fund, the Ethanol Production Incentive Credit. What it would do, this amendment would do is strike the beginning with "The through amounts:", excuse me, strike beginning with "The through"...the word "The" through the word "amounts:" and insert the following. "It is the intent of the Legislature that the following General Fund amounts be appropriated to the Ethanol Production Incentive Cash Fund in each of the following fiscal years:" and then you go on down in Section 4, there's four subpoints and they would all appear as they do now. So that each of the fiscal years, '95-'96, '96-'97, \$2 million per fiscal year. For each of the fiscal years, '97-'98, '98-'99, \$13 million per fiscal year. For the fiscal year 1999 through 2000, \$9 million and for fiscal year 2000 to 2001, \$3 million. All of that stays in. It will be the Legislature saying it is our intent that that money be appropriated and that's how it will stand. And what would happen then, the next building of the biennial budget, what will actually happen is that the Appropriations Committee will have, certainly with their staff, they will then have, oh, by the way, here's an obligation that we have this next time around, say \$9 million for '99...1999 to the year 2000. That's our obligation. And if we're set in a position where we have more money, we can put more money in, less money we'll have to make a decision, but it would simply be there. Now if the Appropriations Committee did nothing for the most part, it would