

for me a little bit. As you know I've had a little bit of concern about taking all of our money that we might get for some other chemical controls and water quality and so on and so forth. And I should have known, and maybe you can answer this to me right away, we are talking about on page 23, Section 2, "There is hereby created the Noxious Weed Cash Fund. The fund shall consist of proceeds raised from fees imposed for the registration of economic poisons." Since we have over 6,000 different chemicals registered, really 6,700, you know as I said the other day it's all the way from, well to control fleas in dogs to toilet bowl cleaner. What is the definition, and I should know that. I'm just asking for a little clarification. I know we can't include that many because your fiscal note would not be correct. Can you tell me what economic poisons are, the difference?

SENATOR DIEPKS: I'm not sure I have the correct definition for that, Senator Nelson. I think that we just group them in a group called economic poisons that are registered by the Department of Agriculture. You know we know there are 6,700 of them and they do vary from herbicides and insecticides to flea collars and spray bombs and this sort of thing. There are 6,700 registrations and they do bring in currently \$10 per registration. Under this bill the registration fee would increase from \$10 to \$40 for registration, feeling...we feel that with that increase in registration fees that we can produce \$187,000 worth of money for the weed fund, and then match that with General Funds.

SENATOR NELSON: My next...really my next concern is, as I've said before, I certainly have nothing wrong with fighting the weeds and it is necessary. But I'm wondering if we're going down the path, you know a fee on all of these chemicals, like back to the fleas on the cats to support the weed fund when again we're going to have to have pretty soon maybe a fee on Ramrod, or something like that to address the chemicals in the water and the herbicide and pesticide controls. I'm in a very precarious position here of not supporting the weed fund, but I'm having...I'm having reservations about opening up the door. I guess maybe it's...I liken it to LB 89 a while ago, the first big bunch that comes in gets all the money, the rest of us are going to be holding our hands from then on out. I kind of wonder if this isn't going to happen on the chemicals.

SENATOR DIERKS: Well my answer is I hope that being the first