

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

March 22, 1999      LB 142

SENATOR CUDABACK: So would they be General Fund dollars?

SENATOR BEUTLER: They would be...they would be the monies that are currently going into the Ethanol Production Fund, which is some General Fund money and some checkoff money, and there used to be some fertilizer tax money in there. I'm not sure if there are other funds also. Perhaps.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Okay. I...I get...

SENATOR BEUTLER: But it's not, no, it's not General Funds.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Okay. I guess I was just curious why you didn't go with the General Fund type dollar into the same motion, so to speak, without having to go a roundabout way in taking funds that were obligated to another.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well, I think that's a good question and I'm trying to propose to the Legislature and have the Legislature look at several different kinds of alternatives to the problem.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Um-hum.

SENATOR BEUTLER: I don't necessarily prefer one to the other.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Yeah.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Actually, I think the first one that I suggested would perhaps be the easiest and the best. But if you take...if you're giving a \$13 million windfall to the cities and the counties, I think it's a legitimate question to ask whether the General Fund should be further...should be further taxed to provide the make-up money to the NRDs.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Um-hum.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mean, maybe that make-up money should come from the windfall that's going to the counties and the cities...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Okay. Okay. Okay.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...or at least structured so that's what