

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

April 6, 2004

LB 1065

the corn checkoff, and the rationale offered being that the prices of corn are high, and it can be afforded, and so forth. And I have to say that it concerns me a little bit when corn prices are higher than they have been, and for that reason, and apparently that reason alone, that the checkoff should be doubled. The checkoff, effectively a tax, should be doubled so as to support this. And I have to say that I'm no big fan of gas tax either, and that gives me a bit of heartburn as well. But I have to say that I find it offensive that there would be statements made, because corn is at \$3.00 instead of \$2.00, that that's good enough rationale to double the checkoff. And I don't know what Senator Wehrbein's rationale was, or what motivated him to file that amendment. And I don't know if it's coming back today. But the rationale that was offered, I...it's disappointing to me that there would be an angle taken toward corn producers to double the checkoff. Ethanol is good. I appreciate its development. I appreciate what it's done for economic development across Nebraska. If you look at the map of ethanol plants, there aren't any in the Panhandle. And that checkoff would double for corn growers across the state of Nebraska, especially those in the Panhandle, that checkoff would double, and there is no benefit, and there doesn't stand to be a benefit, it's looking like, for corn growers in the Panhandle. And I just...I couldn't sit on my hands any longer, and especially when, I guess, that I was afraid that there would be a reconsideration on the checkoff from yesterday of doubling that checkoff. Because although it's tempting to try to get that move along and hurry along, I'm just concerned. And I'm a bit concerned that there wasn't probably a hearing on doubling the checkoff, because I would imagine there'd be some public input, and especially from the far reaches of the state, being the western part of the state, where there are no ethanol plants, and consequently no direct benefit to that corn checkoff. Already the Panhandle is a net importer of corn, and so there are some concerns about what ethanol plants would do. But that's good. That's good. The more plants we have, the more competition there is in the marketplace. And I think many folks would be beneficiaries of that, whether it's a community needing jobs. I think Senator Cunningham pointed out, very appropriately, what 30 jobs in a small community or a less populated county means, compared to the more urban areas of the