

SENATOR BEUTLER: Madam President and members of the Legislature, I would just like briefly to indicate some opposition to the amendment. I appreciated Scott Moore's suggestion of perhaps eliminating the second sentence, if that old language is language that is offensive to people, but I think it would be a mistake to eliminate entirely the prerogative of the ethanol board to join a national organization. I think you all are very much aware that this is a critical time for ethanol in terms of developing...the possibility of developing a national market, and certain aspects of that market are dependent upon federal interpretations. I think it would be a major mistake not to be involved in Washington and not to have the voice of ethanol heard in Washington and maximized in Washington at this particular point in time in history. And I think that preventing them entirely from joining a national organization would preclude, to a certain extent, a degree of participation, and I don't think we want to preclude or discourage any participation at the national level now, whether that participation is direct participation through lobbying, or nondirect participation through other public education mechanisms and efforts in the Capitol. So I would hope that you would not be in favor of this particular amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Coordsen.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Madam President and members of the body. Again, to continue the dialogue just a little bit, I guess my concern, and certainly I am supportive of LB 364, and the things that we do in ethanol promotion through that commission or through the board, now, should 364 be adopted. What struck me about this is that, as a general rule, we provide statutes that give a substantial amount of latitude to the board members, who are appointed by the Governor, to carry out the role and mission of that particular board, whatever the cause may be, and rarely, if ever, provide the exact sort of direction here as to what the money must be used for. I think that Senator Moore's suggestion that striking the second section would solve a lot of questions in my mind, there's a question that is the \$30,000 limiting, for an example. Suppose that there were enough organizations working nationally that it takes 35, 40 or 50 thousand dollars on the part of Nebraska's Ethanol Development Board to ensure that national efforts are, in fact, successful, are we going to be limited to \$30,000? I don't know. I think that they should have the authority to be members