

waste ought to be spread across the entire area, whether it is on a fee basis or whether it is through the General Fund, and I have a hunch the Appropriations Committee would prefer it be a fee basis, but it ought to be spread more broadly. Number two, I don't think we want to get into the position of singling out one particular area because they are vulnerable, identifiable, and indefensible,...

PRESIDENT: Thirty seconds.

SENATOR SCHMIT: ...and require them to pay the major burden of the recycling cost. And, number three, I think it ought to be, whatever we do, ought to be done on a sustainable basis, something which we know will be here a year from now, or five years from now, or fifty years from now, and still address the problem. So, Mr. President, and members, I would still support the Beck amendment. If it is not successful, then I would ask you to take a look at several other amendments which will be forthcoming.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Morrissey, please.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Yes, Mr. President, and members, I would be very interested, Senator Schmit, to see your amendments as I agree, all products should be addressed. The bill should spread the cost across the entire spectrum of the products in the waste stream. I, personally, was not ready to introduce something like that right now or amend it in such a way because of the problems that such a widespread tax administratively would cause. I think because the product is identifiable in a large portion of the waste stream, it is a good reason that you can discriminate against them. A fee based on a specific subset of products can be justified because it is consistent with our plan to reduce waste, prevent waste, and recover materials and recycle. So I think that is a good reason to discriminate against some of these products. We must get started. Until I see something better, I am more than willing to go with Senator Johnson's proposal and my amendment, newsprint, tires, and a business fee. We must get started on this by the end of '92, we are going to be up against a wall possibly. But I, again, to focus back on Senator Beck's amendment, I do not believe we can...we should support Senator Beck's amendment because I do not think we can focus the money generated from the tires simply on the tire problem. Thank you.