

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

May 10, 2005

LB 90

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So that leaves 97 percent that ethanol would have to make up. Although not all of America's energy needs are relying on foreign oil.

SENATOR CONNEALY: About (inaudible)...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But being realistic, we know that ethanol is not going to substantially reduce that reliance. But this is mainly...if it would be honestly proposed, and if it would work as it should--I mean the ethanol effort now--it should be argued as a way for farmers to get rid of certain products, make money on them. Because not...corn is not the only one. But it can provide some income for farmers who produce various crops that can be converted to alcohol. That would be a more honest and direct, right approach, wouldn't it?

SENATOR CONNEALY: I...it is a strong increase for communities and for agriculture. But it...but I do believe that it can be part of a more diversified energy portfolio. I really do. I think we also have to have more renewables in other areas. I think we have to have wind and the photovoltaics and other things. And we ought to eventually move to hydrogen-based fuel.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. Now, with what Nebraska is doing, how many small towns that are dying on the vine now do you think will be rescued as a result of these subsidies that the state is giving to these ethanol plants, these boondoggles, as I call them?

SENATOR CONNEALY: It will...the plants that go to small communities--Plainview in particular--are a huge increase in income for those small towns.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Other than...

SENATOR CONNEALY: Some of them...some plants are, like, in Blair, where you already have economic activity in other areas. It's a big increase in income there. In Columbus (inaudible)...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: If every plant goes on line that is in the