

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

April 6, 2004

LB 1065

political compromise when in fact what needs to be done is for the body to say, you know what, an ethanol answer is important enough that we're going to vote for a cloture vote to move the bill in whatever form it's in now, rather than to get pushed around as to what is or is not in there. There is a relationship, I think, to encouraging ethanol and in fact the motor vehicle fuel tax. It's a legitimate part of the bill. It's supported and can be lived with by the people who make use of the motor vehicle fuel tax. It includes the truckers who pay it, and it includes the Highway Trust Fund that now uses it to build roads. And in fact, those parties can live with LB 1065 as it is written. I do not understand the need to rush to a compromise by doubling the checkoff, which we don't need to do at this moment. We will need to do it if we have five extra plants that we can't discourage, but we don't need to do it at this moment. I don't see the need to why we should embrace an interest from a LUST Fund that should be spent for some environmental implications of underground storage tanks, not for ethanol. I don't see why we need to do this. What I think we need to do is to embrace the hard work that's in LB 1065, and as a Legislature say, you know what, the rule of the majority is legitimate here. The rule of the majority is legitimate. And at this point in the session, the clock being used against us to force us to do things that the majority of us don't want to do, is the fault here. The fault needs to be taken up by doing a cloture vote and moving the bill in its current form, and that we stand by the principle that in these matters, the common drudge of silver to silver, of money from one hand to another, are things that can be done by majority vote. I would confess that you take the power of the majority to compel the minority, that's not the kind of thing that a simple majority works on. I think there are social justice issues that we don't easily fit into the notion of majority rule. This is, where are going to collect money and to what pot we're going to take it. This is the kind of stuff that majority rule should cover. And right now, we're not acting on that basis. And the body, I think, affirmatively could announce that that is a fair rule at this time of the session on issues like this. A cloture vote taken now would put us on the Wehrbein amendment and we'd vote on the Wehrbein amendment. We would have our answer. And by the way, I'm going to vote no. It's \$10 million shy, it pushes off the