

that if one of us follows the rules, we should all follow the rules and I believe that we are stretching the rules to a great extent here. And with that, Madam Chairman, I withdraw my request for consideration.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Schmit. We will now recognize senators wishing to speak to this motion to reconsider. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President, members, I would rise to ask a question to either of the three cointroducers of this amendment, or co, I guess, speakers to this amendment so far. The question I have is, Senator Landis, if you're here, David, you mentioned that the proposal by changing the definition of fertilizers that that was going to balance the numbers. Are we...what are we talking about in terms of numbers? I didn't get that handout and I'm curious in terms of where we are on the numbers because I think the way the bill sat it was still approximately at least \$5 million short. And your argument is, is that by changing the definition in the nitrogen, pulling that out of the fertilizer \$4.00 fee, that we're going to balance that \$5 million hold that's in the bill currently?

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, you ask a very fair question. There are three different issues to take into account on the fiscal side of this measure. This will handle one of them. There will be two others.

SENATOR HALL: They are not in this amendment that you intend to offer?

SENATOR LANDIS: Are the other two solved in this amendment? They are not.

SENATOR HALL: Okay.

SENATOR LANDIS: And the one that you ask about is not solved in this amendment, but this does do as I said, it solves a number problem. There are a couple of other number problems that will arise and we'll need to deal with those at another point.

SENATOR HALL: What number do we solve with this?

SENATOR LANDIS: Okay, the one number problem we have is this. We predicted the amount of money that at a \$4.00 fertilizer tax