

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

April 21, 1999 LB 605

SENATOR SCHROCK: The ethanol checkoff or the corn checkoff and the sorghum...grain sorghum checkoff does end December 31st in the year 2000. It has a year and a half to run, and if we pass this...if we don't pass this bill it ends at that time. This doesn't change the ending date. It doesn't extend the checkoff. And so, Senator Coordsen, I'm sorry about that confusion. I hope you'll come on board. And I know this is a change in direction from what the Revenue Committee decided to do, but we have involved the industry and we have involved the producers. Not all the...not everybody has been a willing party. We've had to twist some arms and raised our voices a time or two, but this is where we're at. And the ag community can't agree 100 percent on this but I think we're headed in the right direction. With that, I hope you'll defeat the committee amendments and vote for the Stuhr amendments.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Schrock. Further discussion on the committee amendments, Senator Raikes, followed by Senator Stuhr, Don Pederson, Baker, and Beutler.

SENATOR RAIKES: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Legislature. I'm going to support the committee amendments. I agree with the conclusion of Senator Coordsen, although not the...perhaps not for the same reasons. As near as I can tell, this would not involve an additional tax increase for corn producers and, also, even though we may not have had a public hearing on this specific proposal, we did...I think ideas were presented in public hearings that pretty much cover what's discussed here. My concern is that the Revenue Committee, in considering this issue, decided to, as Senator Redfield pointed out, decided to focus on the need for marketing help rather than production help, and it was mentioned that it doesn't work to buy market share. Well, I'm not convinced it works any better to buy production capacity. I guess a question I would raise is, is the incentive needed? Well, if the answer is, yes, that the incentive is needed, it must be that these plants can't make money without an incentive. Well, if they can't make money without an incentive, why are we...why are we trying to "incent" more production? Wouldn't it make sense to...to try to help them market more so maybe some of the existing production capacity would be more feasible, economically more profitable? And in particular, as I understand it, and I don't know as the