

SENATOR JOHNSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of Senator DeCamp and that is in looking at Section 26 of your amendment, Senator DeCamp, you would levy a tax of \$150 for each one million dollars of gross proceeds of products manufactured in the sales of which have consumated within the state, does that mean simply that both the manufacturer and the sale of the product must be done in the State of Nebraska or instead does it mean that the manufacture can occur anyplace in the other 49 states so long as the sale of the product is done in Nebraska and then the tax shall be imposed?

SENATOR DE CAMP: I'll have to check that out to get you the exact details. What we are talking about is a two tiered tax and we are talking hopefully it will raise somewhere between \$500,000 - \$750,000 exactly how it functions, I will get you some details on it if that would be satisfactory.

SENATOR JOHNSON: All right, thank you.

SENATOR DE CAMP: We left it at a two tiered tax, a very limited tax rather than try to have it hit a whole bunch of things, keep the cost of collection down and because these people are the ones that are strongly supporting the legislation and then in essence supporting the paying of the tax.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Fowler, do you wish to be recognized on the motion?

SENATOR FOWLER: Yes. I address the committee amendments and I support the adoption of the committee amendments. I have a pending kill motion and I think the adoption of these amendments will make it more defensible to kill the bill. I think that it is worth pointing out that the difference and I think that Senator Johnson raises a good legal question about what exactly is the meaning. The difference between this and other litter taxes that have been tried in the past is that previously it was on both the retail and wholesale level. The amendment now as I understand it is just at the wholesale and manufacturing level which cuts considerably the amount of revenue that would be raised. Now I don't know if Senator DeCamp can offer specific figures, I wouldn't even want to ask him to try to come up with specific figures as to how much less revenue would be raised with his amendment than under the old approach. But the reason that this is done, if you were to believe the industry they would want to raise as much money as possible to deal with the litter question. You wouldn't think that they would give up a major source of revenue. The reason this is