

Chambers, is we've put the ethanol bill up there. That takes 16 of the \$17 million, so we can't pass any of the rest of them.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Are you willing to work with me then to undo what we did on ethanol...

SENATOR CROSBY: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...so that you can have yours?

SENATOR DIERKS: I'm not doing any trade-offs, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No, (laugh) this isn't a trade-off, this is...I'm talking about butchery.

SENATOR DIERKS: I see. Well, I'm not in the butchery business yet either. Some folks thought that's what I did as a veterinary surgeon, but...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, let me ask you this, if it were ethanol or yours, which would you...

SENATOR DIERKS: I'm not in any...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...which would you prefer?

SENATOR DIERKS: I'm just not going to be doing any trade-offs, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Not a trade-off, I'm asking about a preference. Which to you is more important or a higher priority for you, 106 or the ethanol bill?

SENATOR DIERKS: Well, I just...I wouldn't...I wouldn't want to make that decision right now. I don't want to...I don't want to make a trade-off, because if you get down to where I thought you were going was how are we going to make up this loss in revenue that's on the fiscal note, then I think you'd see that we don't need to do a trade-off, I don't think we need to do that at all. I think there's enough...

SENATOR CROSBY: Time.

SENATOR DIERKS: ...added income to our citizens that we'll make that up income tax wise.