

with, not realizing how progressive this fee increase is and I think that's the center of my discussion. It is much too progressive at this stage of the game. I am not on the Natural Resources Committee. There seems to be a difference on the Natural Resources Committee about this amendment. I feel it's appropriate that we should stop and consider this which, in essence, leaves it flat. My point is I don't think there has been a good case made for the rapid progressivity of this...of this fee. Some have worked it out. It goes from \$78, runs up to \$100 in '98; in 1999 it starts again at \$110, and by 2002, which is only 10 years away, it reaches nearly \$150, in fact, it's \$146.79. I think at this stage of the game it's too early to know where we have to go with this fee. It's not necessary to rise near this rapidly, as I understand it. I think it would be much more comfortable to leave it as it is and have a little better idea of our experience, have a little bit of idea of the actuarial soundness of this. I say it that way because I see this as a form of an insurance policy. Evidently, that is the intent of this, to raise enough money to meet the needs of the potential demands on this fund. But it just seems to me, without having the benefit of all discussed in the committee, that this is going up much too fast, that it's not fair, to go back to what Senator Larb was bringing up, it's not fair to have a fee in there just flat, just blanket for all owners of these tanks without at least taking into account the size, the volume of the material that goes through this. I am in the process of trying to find out what some of the volumes are among our hospitals, our schools, filling stations, if you will, on the farm storage, if you will, counties, state, whatever. It seems to me that to make this this aggressive at this stage is not fair. Perhaps there needs to be something done on a volume basis, that if you do run a 100,000 gallons through a year, which I, I guess, at this point I consider quite high, that that would have a much more risk of an underground leak than those of us, many included government entities, that perhaps only run five or ten thousand gallons of fuel a year or even to 20. I admit it may be relative, depending on where you're at and the given business. But I just feel that at this point it would be proper to strike this. It was not part of the original committee amendments. And if there is a need to face this issue, then let's do it somewhere other than on the floor in the future or let's have a...even a committee amendment which I would be receptive to that some might think it more fair. But simply to arbitrarily add 5 percent per year, 10 percent per year, ad infinitum, is, to me, is unfair and I submit that it