

let me just identify one, those brand names that contain Atrazine. Now remember, in the first instance, that probably the whole reason for this bill is because groups of people were fearful that Atrazine could not be used in this state at all if we left regulation in the hands of EPA. And Atrazine, for those who know, is the number one chemical that we will probably have to deal with in terms of figuring out how to continue to use it but with restrictions that prevent the continuing deterioration of the ground water. Millions and millions of dollars worth of Atrazine are sold under three or four brand names in this state every year. If you left the current mechanism in place, that would mean that those ten to \$20 million worth of sales, or more, would be paying a 100 dollar fee and a 100 different other products out there that maybe have 10,000 worth of sales, 15, 20, they would be paying the same fee and all of the regulatory energy is going towards the Atrazine. I think what has happened in this case is that certain chemical dealer interests have figured out that this is a very good deal for them because they sell those high volume products, but it's not fair. It's just not fair. And, as in most taxation systems, there is not a system, in my opinion, that is completely fair, but certainly a system that taxed in accordance with the volume is much more fair and that is essentially what this amendment would do.

**PRESIDENT MOUL:** Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Baack.

**SPEAKER BAACK:** Yes, Madam President and colleagues, I rise in opposition to this amendment and I do understand where Senator Beutler is coming from and I do understand why he is proposing this, and one other state, I think Iowa, has a system somewhat similar to this. I don't know if it's exactly the same but it is somewhat similar to this. But I think by going to this kind of a system we're going to set up ourselves to having a lot of the money that we raise used for administration of just administering the fee because you're going to have a lot of record keeping, and a lot of things that are going to have to go on on the part of both, both on the state level and at the local level as to which pesticides they sold. You're going to have an awful lot of things that are going to have to be kept track of over the years to determine the exact volume of sales of every one of these and then compute how much fee you're going to pay on that. So I think that, you know, I would prefer right now going with a flat fee which is what is proposed in LB 588 and in most states that is exactly what they do. They just simply have a flat fee that they charge. This cuts down on the