

any sort of stop loss on it. But it nevertheless is a question mark as to how many plants would qualify and what we're talking about in terms of lost revenue here. And the question is, do we really need it? And from what I've heard, there's not much use of it now. There's not much clarity that it will be used in the future. It's not an essential part of this package, and in my view we ought to just let it go at this point for fear of what we may be obligating ourselves. Again, as I talked with Senator Wehrbein earlier, how do we pay for what the credits are currently you've just adopted through the previous Wehrbein amendment? How do we pay for it? We don't know. We've got money evidently for the next few years, but what new plants come on board, what new obligations we take on could send us in a few years into a very serious crises as to how we fund our obligations. We've got to think about that. And without those answers in place, this amendment only makes matters worse because of the potential it has, not what it is currently costing us, not what it would cost us next year or this year, but what down the road it could end up costing us. And that's why I'm suggesting why don't we wait and see and if a plant is proposed, if a company is interested in doing ETBE, if they need this credit, then they can come back to us just as Cargill evidently has come back to us and said this is what we need. And I don't understand that this is part of what they need. If anybody is ready to argue that, I'd like to hear it because I've not heard it. In fact, I remember the Cargill article that indicated they don't need any tax credits. They don't need any incentives, that they'll make the decision based on what's best for their company in a broader term. And I wish they would make that decision in that sense. But evidently that's really not the case. Either they're sending a public message one way and a private the other way or they're simply misleading people at least in terms of their impressions. And so I'm suggesting again that the obligation here is not clear. This tax credit is not essential. We're buying a pig in a poke and I don't think we ought to be taking that step. We've been burned before in tax credits of this kind. I don't want to make this mistake again so I'm going to ask you to vote against this amendment and suggest if you're not certain about it, if you don't know what you're voting for, best take the cautious side and vote against it.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Wesely. Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, I could not let