

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

March 24, 2004 LB 479

applications, the qualification period is producing at an annual rate of 100,000 gallons before or by June 30 of this year. There is still some wiggle room in there, some people are assuming. I wouldn't think they'd a gone to the trouble of even applying, filling out an application and signing a contract with the Department of Revenue. It was in Madison County. I don't have the name of the entity, but Madison County that applied about, I guess, ten days ago, I'd have to say. So I don't want to remove this language. I think the bill is fine as it's amended now. We need to get it adopted, passed, moved over to Final Reading, and adopt the changes we make here. They're in...they are in accord with what the Attorney General said we had to do now and I simply think that to take this language out of the bill would be sending the wrong signal and open us up to who knows how many more applications. I'm becoming a little cynical and thick-skinned on this thing. I've never ever in my wildest dreams thought people would come in and try to set up stills to qualify on the eleventh hour, fifty-ninth minute, and we're still getting applications. So my point is leave this language in there so we do not get any more applications. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Baker. Further discussion on the Schrock amendment? Senator Landis, followed by Senators Kremer, Hartnett, and Wehrbein. Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature, the language that is sought to be taken out by the Schrock amendment says this: The Tax Commissioner shall not accept any applications for any new agreements on or after the effective date of this act. This is an application form; our Tax Commissioner accepting an application form. We get the power...no contract has been signed. No agreement has been reached. There is no impairment of contracts. It's an application. Now two sides...two points about the question. First, we need to drive a stake through the heart of a form of exemption we cannot now afford and promises us a serious budgetary process over time. Until such time as we can afford \$25 million to \$100 million more, we should stop this. We've done everything we know how to do, short of any constitutional provision, and acknowledging the agreements that are out there