

there was some additional cost, obviously. But I am not aware that if this is adopted it is going to be vetoed. That's not my understanding, but if I'm in error, some of you who have gone back can say that I'm in error. But I think it's the right thing to do and it ought to be adopted.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Well, Mr. President and members, I'm going to just review again, because I believe I have a responsibility to do that. Some of the reasons that Senator Landis touched upon as to why we shouldn't make it retroactive, he says, or not he said, but the petroleum marketers association have decided it shouldn't be retroactive and my response to that is this. That, of course, again, there is a very small number of individuals who are involved and so the majority says, well, let's just take care of those from this point forward. The additional fiscal impact of the Warner amendment cannot be calculated and that is correct. But by the same token, as Senator Warner has said, there is no way, I could not pull a figure out of the air and give you any idea of how much money we are going to expend on this issue before it is taken care of, nor can I tell you how many millions, tens of millions, hundreds of millions of dollars we will be called upon to raise, appropriate, spend to handle other environmental issues and most of them, most of them I think are probably worthwhile and will need to be addressed in order to protect the health and safety of the citizens of this state. The third negative is that it will increase the initial demands on the fund and that's a very serious one, but I don't think it is necessarily one which cannot be addressed because we do know, we do know how much money has been spent by some of those individuals, and in some instances, as has been indicated on the floor, we know what some of their costs might be at this time to complete the cleanup which is something which we do not know insofar as those future problems are concerned. It may...they say it may delay the cleanup of spills for those tanks that are reported after the date of the act because of the fact that it places an extra burden on the fund. Well, it's a matter of getting in line I guess, it's a matter of getting in line. I think that it's possible for any one of us to go back to our districts and probably locate some instance where there is a problem out there not too far from home, even though it is not in our district, where an individual may be totally put out of business because of this problem. I'm going to draw a little parallel which is not really a parallel but a few years ago on