LB 49A

today because when we think about the magnitude of the problem and the difficulties that other states have had with these weed problems and understand that some states are spending in the millions of dollars in their General Funds, I find it not a bit difficult to ask for the advancement of this legislative A bill that calls for \$187,000 to...that calls for this kind of funding when we get to...when we consider the magnitude of the problem. If there is any questions about it, I would sure be glad to try to answer those. Otherwise, I would just urge your advancing this bill to Select File.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you, sir. Discussion on the advancement of the bill. Senator Nelson, followed by Senator Schmit.

SENATOR NELSON: Mr. Speaker and members of the body, I also, somewhat like Senator Dierks, I should have been doing my homework a little bit faster on this. I agree a thousand I agree a thousand percent the weed, the noxious weed problem is out there and the cost to the landowners, everyone, is certainly there. However, I do have a problem. We have herbicide, pesticide contamination. I believe that...and we have other areas. Once we start down the road of user fees, and so on, the problems are monumental. We have underground storage tank leakage as another one. I believe one of the... one of the areas that would be for matching money on this particular bill, the people that sell registered pesticides, the flea...the ones that control the fleas and ticks on the cats and dogs, the chemicals for sewer tanks, and so on and so forth. I just attended a meeting this morning over across on pesticides and herbicides and the problem. The problems are monumental in that particular area. I'm not suggesting that we need one big super fund but I guess I'm kind of caught in between here but I want the body to know that once we start down this road of fees to control one problem, we have a lot of them there. We have over, to be exact, we have over 6,()O chemicals that are produced and SO when we start down the road to tax the users of some of those that have nothing to do with weeds or may not have anything to do with pesticides or herbicides then we're opening up that gate. I'm not in any way against noxious weed control but I'm cautioning you and I will bring up a little bit more of this. We have over 600, nearly 700 chemical appliers and we have water quality to be concerned of. We have pesticides down in our water, and, of course, the nitrogen. And I'm...I just want the body to know that I think that we should move very cautiously in starting to fund one particular area and not keep in mind that