

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

April 21, 1999 LB 605

producers to pay a lot more than they would otherwise pay. On the other hand, the committee amendment, as I understand it and, George, correct me if I'm wrong, would also extend the program in the sense that the money would continue to come in to the gasohol program, but it would be funneled over to pay for the gas tax exemption and, in that sense, the committee, which is something I like, kept to the 1992 agreement, that is, the producer fee was not changed nor were the General Funds changed. And so the deal proceeded as it had been made but simply went to a different kind of ethanol improvement or ethanol...into an ethanol marketing program instead of into an ethanol production program. Now I don't know where we want to go from here. I kind of like the committee amendment too, especially, and I'm getting the information on this now, especially if these ethanol companies are benefiting from LB 775, I would rather turn to marketing and not let them double-dip on the production side with a second incentive above one they're already getting. And, again, I like the committee amendment because it sticks with the original deal between urban and rural people and General Funds going to that purpose and the whole schmear of factors that go into the deal. It doesn't get us back into an argument about that. So I just essentially wanted to make those two points just to at least clarify what it might mean to say that the producer pays more or doesn't, or doesn't pay more. And, at least from my...what I've heard so far, I would as soon stick with the committee amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Connealy.

SENATOR CONNEALY: I rise in...thank you. I rise in opposition to the committee amendments. We had credits at the pump from...in the eighties until 1992 and it performed a real function. We developed a market for ethanol all across the whole state. We became one of the highest users of ethanol in the United States. And then in 1992 we switched to a production credit and then we became...we went from a net importer of ethanol into the state of Nebraska to a net exporter, where we are today. We built plants and that's what production credits do. You know, I may have some problems with the bill in totem (sic), but I think that the direction of going from a credit at the pump to a producer credit is probably the right