

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

January 21, 2004 LB 479

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...for whatever the other party is putting up. I should have designated them A and B. A enters a contract with the state, B. Let's say all of the requirements to constitute a valid contract are present. If A relied on that contract to A's detriment, meaning that A did something which would not have been done but for that contract, and it cost A something, A has relied on the contract to A's detriment. If B has agreed that when a certain condition is met by A, B will kick in and do something; if A meets that requirement, B can be forced by the law to kick in. That's specific performance. But if that is not the thing, then B would respond in money damages. Since we don't know really what the contract provisions are...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...and how this might impact...

SENATOR CUDABACK: You may continue, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President. Since we don't really know what the specific provisions of a contract are and how this language would impact, not might but would impact, it cannot be determined that any existing contract is going to be impaired by the adoption of this language. Perhaps some operator, some speculator, may have undertaken a certain amount of work with the notion of proceeding further in order to gain more, but that consideration exists outside the four corners of the contract that actually exists between that operator and the state. Since I do not like ethanol production being underwritten with taxpayers' hard-earned money, I'm in favor of any language that restricts that area of plundering the public till. You all's President said last night people can manage their money better than the government. Well, you all are giving it to the ethanol speculators. But you and you all's President would agree it's all right to let the speculators take your money because they are all in it together. He wants some of it. He wants his family to have some. He wants Halliburton to have some, Bechtel to have some. Anything that would restrict ethanol production based on public subsidies, I'm for