

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

March 29, 2000

LB 1234

describing and I will describe in different terms what Senator Schrock has described, but the effect of adopting the Chambers amendment is to allow the same old pricing schemes that prejudices ethanol to continue to exist; the pricing scheme that says we will price by octane level. That's, if you've watched over the years, that's generally the way it is, isn't it? Eighty-seven is a lower octane, not as much refinement in it, not as much sophistication, that's the lowest; 89, that has ethanol in it but they always sell the ethanol at 89. It's always the more expensive one so ethanol never gets to compete with the cheaper gas because it's always priced more because it's higher octane. Why don't I have a choice of buying 87 octane ethanol? Why is that choice taken away from me? Who is taking away choices from who here? Why don't I, ask yourself, why don't you have that choice of buying 87 octane ethanol? You don't have it because they won't...they won't take the 85 over the pipeline and mix it, and that's all this bill says. We want a choice. We want a choice of 87 octane ethanol. Anyway you look at it there are only so many things you can sell, and every time you take one, you've taken a choice away from the consumer and add another, and there's always going to be that trade-off as long as you have two or three pumps. So what is the marketeer going to do who is interested in selling petroleum? He's always going to benefit the one, the choices that maximize the sale of the petroleum. All that this bill is saying is, hey, since we can't have all the choices in the world, we want a structure that allows for a choice for ethanol at 87 octane. If you want to sell two products at 87 octane, you can do that. If the 87 regular is going to be cheaper than ethanol and you think there's going to be a significant difference, you can do that. But why would it be cheaper? I mean if 87 octane ethanol is made from the 85 less refined product, wouldn't it stand to reason that the less refined product, the product that has taken less work and less...less refinement is going to be somewhat cheaper on average over time always. I mean I don't think this bill is building on anything except the logic of the system and it's trying to counteract the built-in logic of the petroleum marketers that logic ethanol right out of the picture at the level of the cheapest gasoline. That's all this bill does, but if you adopt the Chambers amendment, you allow the same old, same old pricing structure to exist. Thank you.