

be included within the budget simply because it would appear on the sheet. They would have to approve it, they would have to approve it. That is a better process to follow. But I understand the closeness of Senator Wehrbein to the ethanol bill and the position that he is in being wanting to obligate the Cash Fund or the General Fund in all of the years and also Chair the Appropriations Committee and I can understand that and he's perfectly justified in that position, but we need to be careful. If we don't adopt the amendment, I suppose all chaos may develop later on as, again, we get to education. I could see a lot of amendments begin flying on special ed, I can see amendments begin to fly on Equalization Fund and we're going to use the transfer mechanism so it will not appear anywhere in the appropriations process and it will just be done, and we will begin using this mechanism as a way to bypass the future legislatures on the appropriations process. That's not a good policy. So to summarize, this amendment simply says that all of the monies that we are going to appropriate, we shall, it is our intent. That's what is going to be there, but it will also appear within the appropriations process so that we can make changes as the situation may develop. That's how we do all bills. Even if you had a bill that put dollars in, it still is that way and we don't want to change that particular process on something as major as this. So I would urge the adoption of the amendment, again, emphasize this does not change the dollar amounts at all. Thank you.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. Senator Coordsen, on the Senator Bernard-Stevens' amendment.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body, you know, 377 came about as a voluntary effort on the part of production agriculture resulting from decisions made by the various groups, the corn growers, the grain sorghum producers, the Farm Bureau, Farmers Union, whatever, agreeing that part of this economic development incentive value would accrue to agriculture and they felt it was only true, right and just that part of the cost should be borne by agriculture. Somehow or the other, at least by my interpretation of the statutes, we've gotten off track somehow with the idea that there is a budget exposure that isn't provided for in statute by some mechanism or another and I would ask, Senator Warner is the author of this and I'm referencing 66-4142, the essence of which, which was LB 23 in 1993 which provides that if the credits are more than the money available, the credits going to the Ethanol Production