

Cash cow corn husking

Proposed ethanol bill stops short of state support

Ed Schrock must not drive a very old car. If he did, he probably wouldn't have introduced LB1234.

The bill requires gasoline sold in the state to contain a certain percentage of ethanol (something that those '70s and '80s cars don't seem to digest that well). Two percent of nearly all gas would need to be a renewable fuel – most likely ethanol – in 2001, and that percentage would increase in the years following. High-octane gas and aircraft fuel wouldn't be covered under this proposed law; we're talking about the gas that most people use in their cars and trucks.

Schrock's bill is basically from Gov. Johanns' office. It's something that he and his agriculture friends came up with to help out farmers.

Schrock's bill is basically from Gov. Johanns' office. It's something that he and his agriculture friends came up with to help out farmers (more ethanol equals more grain, equals more cash for farmers).

The problem is, outside of Johanns and these farmers, no one supports the bill.

Western Nebraskans don't want it, because they don't have many farms that will benefit from the bill. Ranchers in the state simply don't have much use for it.

We Eastern city folk don't want to pay prices any higher than the out-of-control ones we cringe at currently.

Truckers and other out-of-state travelers won't want to

encounter any ethanol requirements when they fill up at Nebraska pumps!

So if urbanites, hicks, non-Nebraskans and everybody who drives old cars don't want to be required to use ethanol – why pass a bill like this?

Maybe the Legislators just want a governmental mandate. In Nebraska, any state requirement on the private sector wouldn't normally go over very well, but this could be different.

Philosophically, this state has been reasonably strong against mandates. If we're going to set a mandate, let's make it an important one that most people can agree on.

Perhaps we should start down the slippery slope of required percentages and mandated numbers.

We think not.

Editorial Board

Josh Funk (editor) • J.J. Harder • Cliff Hicks • Samuel McKewon • Dane Stickney • Kimberly Sweet • Lindsay Young

Letter Policy

The Daily Nebraskan welcomes brief letters to the editor and guest columns, but does not guarantee their publication. The Daily Nebraskan retains the right to edit or reject any submissions. Submitted material becomes property of the Daily Nebraskan and cannot be returned. Anonymous material will not be published. Those who submit letters must identify themselves by name, year in school, major and/or group affiliation, if any.

Submit material to: Daily Nebraskan, 20 Nebraska Union, 1400 R St., Lincoln, Neb. 68588-0448 or e-mail to: letters@unl.edu

Editorial Policy

Unsigned editorials are the opinions of the spring 2000 Daily Nebraskan. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, its employees, its student body or the University of Nebraska Board of Regents. A column is solely the opinion of its author. The Board of Regents acts as publisher of the Daily Nebraskan; policy is set by the Daily Nebraskan Editorial Board. The UNL Publications Board, established by the regents, supervises the publication of the paper. According to policy set by the regents, responsibility for the editorial content of the newspaper lies solely in the hands of its student employees. The Daily Nebraskan strives to print fair and accurate coverage; any corrections or clarifications will be printed on page three.

Obermeyer's VIEW



Letters to the EDITOR

A-OK

From my interaction with the remaining presidential candidates, one is telling the whole story; one has been honest and dedicated; one has led with integrity and ethics and it is that one that I will be voting for tomorrow. I will be voting for Joel Schafer.

A-Team wants to get people involved and make ASUN an organization that is for the students and will not keep the status quo we have seen year after year.

From the onset, A-Team has set out to create change, and it has done just that. Party members have already involved people who normally would not have been involved, and I have faith that once in office, they will continue to do just that. A-Team and its candidates are this year's best chance for the students of next year to see a difference in ASUN.

So when entering the polls, think about your options and choose a party that already has started doing what it said it would. Vote A-Team!

John Conley
junior
sociology

Impact presidential candidate

Parking woes

After reading the "Parking fees may increase" article (DN, March 6), several questions came to mind, one of which was simply, "Why the heck did they use 'may' instead of 'will'?"

The rest of my questions are aimed more toward the members of the Parking Advisory Committee, and more specifically the eight members who voted to recommend the new plan.

The goal of this new plan was to keep parking fees low by increasing rates on reserved stalls and using other sources of funding.

According to PAC member Tom Myers the plan would include "creating premium parking spots and socking it to those who want those spots."

The PAC also sought to keep prices down for people who were open to parking flexibility.

"We want to keep the prices low for those who want to park but don't care if it's the other end of the lot" is how PAC Chairman James Specht put it.

This new plan may have been conceived with these ideas in mind, but the realization has fallen far short of such lofty goals. When comparing

the increases between different permits, the article listed dollar amounts rather than percentage increases.

The proposed plan offers the following increases in parking permit prices: premium reserved faculty, 75 percent; other reserved faculty, 37 percent; non-reserved faculty, 23 percent; reserved student, 43 percent; non-reserved student, 31 percent and perimeter, 60 percent. Note that the perimeter lot increase is second in percentage only to the premium reserved faculty permits. Who are we socking it to here?

The administration's proposed plan, rejected by the PAC, contained the following increases: reserved faculty, 25 percent; non-reserved faculty, 35 percent; reserved student, 29 percent; non-reserved student, 31 percent and perimeter, 20 percent.

The PAC simply took administration's proposal, created a new category (premium reserved faculty) and then did some very interesting manipulations of the proposed increases. It decided that the premium reserved faculty, as well as the perimeter permits, deserved three times the proposed increase.

The other reserved faculty and reserved student permits needed one and a half times what the administration proposed. Non-reserved student permits will be increased exactly as the administration wanted, while non-reserved faculty get a one-third reduction in the proposed increases. The only winners I see in this proposal are the non-reserved faculty and the parking services' pockets.

While the PAC proposal does "sock it to" those who purchase reserve permits, it also takes a pretty good swing at almost everyone else, especially anyone buying a perimeter pass.

Why did the PAC feel it needed to add onto administration's proposed increases for nearly every category of permit? What happened to keeping the prices low for those who want to park but are open to flexibility? It is hardly rewarding the people willing to park in the perimeter lots by making their permits suffer a percentage-increase second only to a currently nonexistent category of "premium" stalls in the faculty lots with the highest demand.

Parking problems at UNL will be with us forever, but this latest attempt at addressing the issues is a far cry from anything beneficial.

Tom Myers, the lone opponent to the plan, was right when he said rec-

ommending it would force the committee to accept blame for the fee increase. Get ready PAC, you've got plenty of blame heading your way ... accept it.

Tim James
graduate student
electrical engineering

More power to Schafer

Heath Mello, Empower, is currently a senator supposedly representing the students in the College of Arts and Sciences. Mr. Mello voted not once, but twice in favor of lobbying against LB1405 on behalf of the student body regardless of what his constituents had asked for.

As a member of the College of Arts and Sciences, I personally contacted Mr. Mello and asked that he vote to remain neutral, as did other members of our college. Unfortunately, he did not feel that our voices and our concerns mattered when he voted both times in favor of lobbying against LB1405.

Joel Schafer, A-Team candidate, is not a current member of the ASUN, but after speaking with him, I hope that he does become one. Mr. Schafer does not deliver the same "flowery speech" when he speaks of his concerns and ideas for our campus. And although we have not been able to see how Mr. Schafer would have voted in the above-mentioned issue, having discussed this issue with him, I have no doubt that he would not have ignored his constituents as did Mr. Mello on two occasions.

Through Heath Mello's position in the ASUN, we have been able to see how he "represents" his constituents. To enable our voices to be heard and represented accordingly by our student government, let's not make the mistake of allowing Heath Mello to become the next president of the ASUN. Instead, we as students need to assume an active role in our student government and vote for the candidate whose concerns are listening to and actively involving the students in issues here on campus.

This is why I am encouraging all students to vote for A-Team and Joel Schafer this Wednesday. The ASUN is meant to represent us, the students, and it is our duty to ensure that it does so.

Sara L. Fiedler
junior
English, psychology