

bill, but simply to point out all those areas that I thought needed some improvement. The amendment that is currently before you is being passed out, and it goes back, again, to the question of taxation, and it goes back, again, to the deep sense of unfairness I feel with the structure of the tax in this particular bill. I think you all recall that the tax is basically a \$100 registration fee per pesticide, and that every pesticide that's labeled, that's registered pays that same fee, regardless of the toxicity, regardless of the volume, and the volume differences are enormous, so that, in my opinion at least, it borders on the ridiculous to suggest that they all should pay the same fee. The amendment that's before you today offers a compromise on my suggestion of yesterday. Yesterday I suggested that I thought the fairer system of taxation was simply one-quarter of a penny on the dollar of gross sales of the various pesticides. The amendment that you have before you now says, okay, leave the \$100 registration fee in place. And for the current program, the way it is today, so be it. I'm not going to reargue arguments lost. But it does say that with regard to the future, with regard to the future, if you want to increase the fee, if there's a need to increase the fee then it will be done on the basis of gross sales. And it authorizes the Department of Agriculture to levy up to, not necessarily, but up to one-quarter of a cent of gross sales. Iowa has a law similar to this which reportedly works; they have a tax on gross sales. So it's not like it's not done in other places in addition to the fairness argument. This eliminates all questions as to having necessary funds to instigate the program, because you will have in place the \$100 fee, as suggested by the proponents of the bill. But I at least think it's important, if not for the present, then for the future to say, and I hope I can get your agreement to say this registration fee concept, flat dollar amount the same for everybody doesn't make sense when you start talking about large amounts of money. It becomes inherently unfair for the small guy, really. And I hope that this is a compromise that...and it is truly a compromise, I hope it's a compromise that you can see fit to adopt. Thank you.

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

SPEAKER BAACK: Yes, Madam President, colleagues, Senator Beutler, I'd like to ask you one question. My understanding is, in discussing with...with some of the people behind the glass, that the information is even not available to be able to do this. The retail people have said that information is not even