

the Natural Resources Committee right now that I think many of you can relate to because it's been an example of some controversy. But the whole question of containment, the whole question of the construction of facilities around both fertilizer and pesticide tanks, that whole area of regulation, storage of chemicals, is under the Department of Environmental Quality. All right, now this FIFRA bill comes along and gives broad authorities with regard to storage in the Department of Agriculture. Okay, what if the Department of Agriculture comes down with provisions that are in conflict with the provisions under the Department of Environmental Control regulations? Now we've added language in the bill that says that we are not taking away the authorities that are previously granted to these different agencies and to the NRDs, but we have not and we need to sort out which agencies are going to predominate on which types of programs. If all of the programs are under the Department of Environmental Quality, there will not be that problem. But if the programs are under the Department of Ag, then I think you have a multiplicity of problems. Another area of conflict will be with the Department of Health. The Department of Health, as you know, has authority over drinking water, whether the contamination to the drinking water is from fertilizers or pesticides or petroleum products or whatever. Now we're coming along with FIFRA and giving the Department of Agriculture authority in this area also. And so, again, once again the question arises in this area where both the Department of Environmental Quality and the Department of Health have authority as to what will be the authority of the Department of Agriculture vis a vis these previously established authorities by the...authorities established by the Legislature previously. The next point that I would like to make is that FIFRA deals with 7,000 different chemicals, 7,000 different chemicals, and the best estimates that I can get are that someplace between 70 and 80 percent of those chemicals are used basically as part of janitorial services, are not used in agriculture at all. They're not agricultural products. So my question is, why is this...why is an agency that's basically regulating nonagricultural chemicals put in charge of agricultural chemicals simply because a portion of the chemicals are used in agriculture? I don't think it's logical to say, just because a portion of the chemicals are used in one industry or another industry, that they should be regulated by an agency whose primary function, I hope, is to promote the marketing of agriculture and whose primary function has not been, at least until recently, largely in the area of the regulation of