

level, or a program designed, as 409 is, where we have trigger mechanisms when the fund either gets to a cap or gets below a certain figure, the funds kick in or kick off. But it shows to the EPA that we are willing to put a fund or design a fund that will put money into the program to meet those environmental releases as they happen to clean up our environment. But I agree with Senator Beutler in that we are going too far with a social program and, in fact, asking the consumer, and for, I guess, a better word, the taxpayers, because this is a tax, to pay for everything or practically everything, and I think the marketers have to be willing to pay something. And I really...I realize that this is a big sticking point on the floor, but I don't recall in my conversations with the Petroleum Marketers Association that they necessarily felt that this \$25,000 deductible was so atrocious. Granted, they have got a lot of members out there that probably would like it a lot lower and I am sure they are supporting this amendment because, obviously, it gets them off the hook of having to pay anything out of their pocket. But they have got to be responsible parties in some case and somewhere in this process I think it is important that they pay something, and \$5,000, Senator Coordsen, I agree is a lot of money, but when you look at the cost of the cleanup, which is close to \$100,000 for a gasoline spill, that is not much that they have to pay and yet the consumer taxpayer is paying the rest. And I just think this amendment, to me, goes too far. Now I have been sitting here scribbling notes down trying to figure out if there is a figure in the middle that might be more palatable to me, personally. It may not be palatable to anybody else, but I think somewhere in the middle, rather than going from 25 to 5, maybe...

SPEAKER BAACK PRESIDING

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR R. JOHNSON: ...25 to 15. I am concerned that we get into a bidding process here as to what level might be fair, but at this point, to protect the fund, I guess I am just going to have to oppose the Schmit amendment. If it is adopted, obviously, I will live with it, but it just seems to me we have got to ask the marketers to pay at least somewhat of a fair share of this program because it is a state-supported, public-supported insurance program that gives them a million dollar policy to clean up any environmental releases that might happen.